

Dr BENTLEY'S  
DISSERTATIONS  
ON THE  
*Epistles of PHALARIS,*  
AND THE  
**Fables of ÆSOP,**  
EXAMIN'D

By the Honourable  
*Charles Boyle, Esq,*

---

—Remember Milo's End;  
*Wedge'd in that Timber, which he strove to rend.*  
Roscomm. Ess. of Transl. Vers.

---

**The Third Edition**

With some Additions, occasioned by a Book entituled *A View*  
of the *Dissertation upon the Epistles of Phalaris, &c.*

---

LONDON,

Printed for *Thos. Bennet,* at the *Half-moon* in *St. Paul's*  
*Church-yard.* 1699.

Dr. Bentley's  
Dissertation  
on the  
Epistles of Phalaris  
and the  
Tables of Asot  
Examined

By Charles Boyle, Esq.

London: Printed by W. B. at the Theatre in St. Paul's Church-Yard, 1734.

Price 1s. 6d.

LONDON:  
Printed by W. B. at the Theatre in St. Paul's Church-Yard, 1734.



---

---

T H E

# P R E F A C E.

**S** O O N after Dr Bentley's Dissertation came out, I was call'd away into Ireland, to attend the Parliament there. The Publick Business, and my own private affairs, detain'd me a great while in that Kingdom; else the World should have had a much Earlier account of Him, and his Performance. For tho' He took above two Years to make his Learned Reflections on Phalaris; yet Two Months would have been enough to have shown him, that he is but a weak Champion in a very frivolous Cause.

I speak not this out of any vain design of setting up for a Quick Writer; but meerly to avoid being thought to have thrown away any considerable part of my life upon so trifling a subject: which, as idle a man as I am, is an Imputation I would not willingly lie under.

I little imagin'd ever to have been engag'd in a Dispute of this nature. I am not over-fond of Controversie even where the Points debated may be thought of some importance; but intrivial matters, and such as Mankind is not at all concern'd in, methinks it is unpardonable. This, ever since I came to have any Opinions of my own, has been one of 'em; and is still, tho' I am unluckily at present brought to all contrary to it. But the Case is this—Dr Bentley has been pleas'd, with some warmth to fall upon an Edition and Version of Phalaris's Epistles;

## The PREFACE.

that I some years since offer'd to the World. He has taken a great deal of Good-natur'd pains to prove, that I had been very foolishly busying my self upon a Contemptible and Spurious Author; and had made a bad Book much worse by a very ill Edition of it. I was very Young, when I appear'd on that occasion; and I appear'd rather as one that wish'd well to Learning than profess'd it; and for both these reasons, promis'd my self good usage from the men of more profound Skill in such matters; Dr Bentley was sensible that his Criticisms would lie under some disadvantage on this account; and therefore, to excuse his making so free with the Edition, was pleas'd to make yet freer with Me; and, according to His Breeding, to tell Me, and all the World, that I had set my name to a Book, which did not belong to me.

The first of these Reflections, had it come single, I could easily have neglected: had he stop'd there, I would have left the Book to shift for it self, and Him to the good opinion he has of his own performances, without endeavouring to lessen it. But when he carried his Criticisms so far as to assert, not only of Phalaris, but his Editor too, that they neither of 'em wrote what was ascrib'd to 'em; he gave me so plain, and so publick an Affront, that I could not, with any tolerable regard to my Reputation, quietly put it up. Thus was I, much against my inclinations, brought into the Lists. It was necessary for me to say something in defence of my Self; and when I did so, I thought it would be judg'd proper for me to say something too in defence of my Author; and to enquire into the justness of those Criticisms which Dr Bentley has advanc'd on this occasion; and which, I foresaw, wou'd be look'd upon, as in some measure aim'd at Me, tho' they did not really belong to me.

## The PREFACE.

I have not any where in my Book asserted, that the Epistles, which carry Phalaris's name, are Genuine; and I am not therefore engag'd to defend their Reputation against the Attacks of Dr Bentley, or any other person, who, by the help of Leisure and Lexicons, shall set up for a Critic in this point. But, as I have not undertaken for their being Genuine; so neither have I, with a decisive and assuming air, pronounc'd 'em Spurious. I express'd my self with that Caution and Reserve in this matter, which I thought became a Young Writer, who was sensible, that the best and ablest Judges were divided in their opinions about it: and I thought it would be a very Indecent part in Me, to make my self a Judge between 'em.

But I was chiefly induc'd to observe these measures, by the Regard I had for the most Accomplish'd Writer of the Age, whom I never think of, without calling to mind those happy Lines of Lucretius,

Quem Tu, Dea, Tempore in omni  
Omnibus ornatum voluisti excellere rebus.

a Character, which, I dare say, Memmius did not better deserve than Sir William Temple. He had openly declar'd in favour of the Epistles: and the Nicety of his Taste was never, I think, disputed by Such as had any themselves. I quoted his Words with that respect which is due to ev'ry thing that comes from him: but must now beg his pardon for it; for I have by this means, I find, drawn him into a share of Dr Bentley's displeasure: who has beneupon given himself the trouble of writing almost fourscore pages solemnly to disprove that One of Sir William's which he has prefix'd to his Appendix; and which, to give him my opinion of his whole

## The PREFACE.

*whole Book at once, is the only good Page there.*

*I am therefore the rather inclin'd to give Dr Bentley's Reflections a Due Examination, on Sir William Temple's account; upon whom I so unhappily occasion'd this Storm of Criticism to fall. In truth, for a Man who has been so great an Ornament to Learning, he has had strange usage from Some who are Retainers to it. He had set the world a Pattern of mixing Wit with Reason, Sound Knowledge with Good Manners; and of making the one serve to recommend and set off the other: but his Copy has not been at all follow'd by those that have writ against him, in a very rough way, and without that Respect which was due both to His Character, and their Own.*

*I will not pretend to determine, on which side, in those Disputes, the Truth lies: only thus much I will venture to say of 'em; that, let Sir W. T. be as much out in some of his Opinions as he's represented to be, yet They, who read both sides, will be apt to fall in with Tully's Opinion of Plato, and say, Cum Illo Ego meherclè errare malim quàm cum istis Scriptoribus vera sentire. I had rather be so Handsomely mistaken as He is, if he be mistaken, than be so Rudely and Dully in the right, as Some of his Opposers, allowing 'em to be in the right, are.*

*There was also another Consideration that determin'd me to write. Dr Bentley's Reflections were understood to go further than either Sir William Temple, or my Self; and to be level'd at a Learned Society, in which I had the happiness to be educated: and which Dr Bentley is suppos'd to attack under those General Terms of Our New Editors, Our Annotators, and Those Great Geniuses with whom Learning, that is leaving the world, has taken up her last Residence.*

*By*

## The PREFACE.

By these, and such expressions as these, with which his Familiar Epistle abounds, he would insinuate as if Phalaris, as slight a piece as it is, had been made up by contribution from several hands, and were the Joint Work of that Eminent Body. But in this he does me too great an honour; and I'm almost tempted to take it, as Terence did the agreeable Reproach of Lælius and Scipio's writing his Plays for him; neither to own, nor deny it. But Terence wrote what might have become those Noble Pens; and therefore did no injury to their Reputation when he favour'd that mistake: whereas I shou'd be extremely to blame, if I shou'd suffer a Report to spread to the disadvantage of so many Excellent Men. I think my self therefore oblig'd to declare, that whatever the Faults of Phalaris are, they are Mine; and I alone am answerable for them. There is a very Deserving Gentleman indeed, who had a little before been the Director of my Studies, and was then My Particular Friend, to whom I have acknowledgments to make on this occasion. I consulted him upon any difficulty; because I thought it not proper for one of my Age to offer any thing to the Public without consulting Some-body. I wish I had advis'd oftner with him, for that my Book would have been much more correct. But excepting Him, no one had a hand in it; nay, scarce a line was ever seen by any-body else as I know of, till it was finish'd. And now I have confess'd thus much, I don't care if I own a little further to Dr Bentley, that I have been again oblig'd to the Same person for his Assistance in consulting some Books in the Oxford Libraries at my request, which in the Places where I have been, were not at all, or not easily, to be met with. The Dr may make what advantages of this he thinks fit; I assure him, I will never recriminate:

for

## The PREFACE.

for I declare to the World, that I sincerely believe the Dr's Dissertation is entirely his own, both as to Matter and Dress; and that no Friend whatever, no not Mr Wotton himself, had any hand in it. The happy Genius of some Authors will for ever secure 'em from all Scandals of this nature: Terence indeed was suspected, but Bavius and Mœvius never were. Dr Bentley has industriously contriv'd to lead his Reader into this Mistake; imagining, I suppose, that the Conquest would have been too cheap for a man of his Rank in Letters, unless he engag'd, like the Hero of a Romance, with great numbers at once. But some men have thought themselves Heroes that were not, and some that were, have mistaken their strength, and in either of these cases have come off but scurvily. The Dr, I'm sure, would have been made very sensible of this in the present Debate, had not I been kinder to him than He was to Himself, and stept in, as I thought it became me, between Him and the just resentment of that Bearded Body. 'Twere pity that any of those worthy Men, who know so well how to employ their hours, should be diverted from the pursuit of Useful Knowledge, into such Trivial Enquiries as these. The Dispute began between Dr Bentley, and Me; and 'tis fit that We Two should end it.

I have a Request to Such as shall give themselves the Trouble of perusing These Papers, that they would do Me, and Dr Bentley, the Justice to compare 'em, Paragraph by Paragraph, with His Dissertations. The Task is a little unreasonable, considering the Length of the Dispute; but 'tis necessary, in order to form a true judgment of the Performance.

DR

---

Dr. BENTLEY's Dissertation  
UPON THE  
Epistles of *Phalaris*, &c.  
EXAMIN'D.

**D**R Bentley, in the Piece I am about to examine, among several other Liberties, has taken this, of writing without any Method. Great Genius's indeed are above ordinary Rules: but it wou'd ill become so unknown a Writer as I am, to exempt my self from 'em; and therefore I shall observe a method in answering him.

I think most of the scatter'd Remarks he has made, in that particular Dissertation which relates to *Phalaris*, will come under one of these Three Heads; They are either some *Arguments*, which he has urged for the *Spuriousness* of the *Epistles*; or some *Faults* which he has found with my *Edition* and *Version* of 'em; or some *Matters of Fact*

B

which

which he has related, as the Grounds of his peevish Quarrel.

These last he has thrown into an odd corner of his Book, as it were out of sight; and plac'd 'em in the Rear of all his Learned Arguments. One wou'd imagine, by the Post he has given 'em, that he distrust'd their strength; or that he wrote his Book first, and found Reasons for it afterwards. However that may be, I think my self oblig'd to clear up this Point in the first place, by setting those *Matters of Fact* in their true light, which Dr Bentley has extreamly disguis'd: and then 'twill be time to consider the wonderful Proofs he has produc'd on his side, and the *Mighty Mistakes* he has thought fit to charge me with.

About four or five Years ago, the worthy Dean of *Christchurch*, Dr Aldrich (of whose College I was then a Member) desir'd me to undertake an Edition of *Phalaris*. I cou'd deny Him nothing, to whom I ow'd so much; and therefore as unfit as I thought my self for such a Task, I undertook it. In order to it, a Manuscript *Phalaris* in the King's Library was to be consulted. It was of no Age or Worth, I heard, being written but just before the restauration of Letters; however it was a Manuscript, and therefore not to be neglected; especially since we had no ancient Copies, either in *England*, or any where else, that I cou'd hear of. I sent to Mr Bennet, my Bookseller in *London*, to get the Manuscript, and desir'd him to apply himself to  
Dr



Dr *Bentley*, in my name, for the use of it ; not doubting in the least a ready compliance with such a request, from one of his Station and Order ; and who besides was at that very time in a Lecture of some Honour and Profit that had lately been set up by one of my Relations : especially, since the Book, which I desir'd to borrow, was of so little importance, that it had scarce been a Favour to have lent it me, if I had not ask'd it. After an Expectation of many months, Mr *Bennet* sent me at last a Collation of part of the Manuscript, with this account ; that he had, with great difficulty, and after long delays, got the Manuscript into his hands ; that he had it but a very few days, when Dr *Bentley* came to demand it again : and would, by no means, be prevail'd upon to let him have the use of it any longer, tho' he told him, the Collation was not perfected : and that he denyed this Request in a very rude manner, throwing out several slight and disparaging Expressions, both of me, and the Work I was about.

This I had reason to take very ill of Dr *Bentley*, and therefore in that part of my *Preface*, where I gave an account of the MSS that were consulted in that Edition, I inserted these words, [*Collatas etiam curavi usque ad Epistolam 40 cum MS<sup>o</sup> in Bibliothecâ Regiâ ; cujus mihi copiam ulteriorem Bibliothecarius, pro singulari suâ humanitate, negavit.*] which, considering the usage I had had from him, was as soft a thing as I could well allow myself to say. The Epistles were no sooner publish'd, but Dr *Bentley* sent me a Letter ;

wherein, after expressing himself with great civility to me, he represented the Matter of fact quite otherwise than I had heard it. I return'd him immediately as Civil an Answer, to this effect : That Mr *Bennet*, whom I employed to wait on him in my name, gave me such an Account of his Reception, that I had reason to apprehend my self affronted : and, since I cou'd make no other excuse to my Reader, for not Collating the King's MS, but because 'twas denyed me, I thought I cou'd do no less than express some resentment of that Denial. That I shou'd be very much concern'd if Mr *Bennet* had dealt so ill with me, as to mislead me in his accounts ; and, if that appear'd, shou'd be ready to take some opportunity of begging his pardon : and, as I remember, I express'd my self so, that the Dr might understand, I meant to give him satisfaction as publickly as I had injur'd him. Here the matter rested, and I thought Dr *Bentley* was satisfied ; especially, since I found Mr *Bennet* persisted in his account, and supported it with farther proofs ; and the Dr seem'd willing to let the Dispute drop, by his not writing to me any further about it, or discoursing Mr *Bennet* concerning it, to whom my Letter plainly refer'd him. In this Mistake was I, for Two Years and an half after the Edition of *Phalaris* ; till at last Dr *Bentley's* Dissertation came out, and convinc'd me, that he had had Vengeance in his Heart all the time. and suspended his Blow only till he cou'd strike, as he thought, to purpose. In this angry discourse of his, he tells the World the same story (bating a Circumstance

cumstance or two which he has alter'd) that he had told me before in his Letter. His words are these: *A Bookseller came to me in the name of the Editors, to beg the use of the Manuscript. It was not then in my Custody; but as soon as I had the power of it, I went voluntarily and offer'd it him, bidding him tell the Collator not to lose any time: for I was shortly to go out of Town for two Months. I was deliver'd, us'd, and return'd: Not a word said by the Bearer, nor the least suspicion in me, that they had not finish'd the Collation.* Diff. p. 66.

Startled at these Assertions thus reviv'd, after a long Silence, and improv'd in Print, I examin'd Mr Bennet again very strictly and particularly. He assur'd me, that every word he had writ to me upon this occasion was punctually true; and that Dr Bentley's account, where it differ'd from his, was entirely false. He drew up the Matter of Fact in writing, and set his hand to it; giving me liberty to make it publick, and to assure the World, that he was ready to justify the truth of what he had written with his Oath, when it shou'd be duly requir'd of him. He added, that Mr Gibson, the Collator, cou'd confirm some Circumstances of his Account; and that his Brother (who was his Apprentice at that time, and was sent by him both to Dr Bentley, and to the Collator) wou'd have attested the Truth of the whole, had he been alive; but he dy'd some Months after this Matter happen'd. However, if his own Testimony, and the Collators, shou'd be liable to Suspicion, yet still there was a Gentleman of known Credit in the World,

*Dr King of the Commons*, who was witness to all that pass'd at one meeting, between him and *Dr Bentley*; and wou'd, he hop'd, be so just to him as to give an account of it. He was not mistaken; for *Dr King* being apply'd to by a Friend of mine, presently wrote him the following Letter, which together with the several Certificates of *Mr Bennet* and *Mr Gibson*, I here offer to the Reader.

See the  
Passage at  
length,  
p. 5.

**W**HEREAS the Reverend *Dr Bentley* has thought fit, in the Appendix to *Mr Wotton's Reflections on Ancient and Modern Learning*, (p. 66, & 67) to insert the following words as Matter of Fact, [viz. A Bookseller came to me in the name of the Editors, &c.] I think my self oblig'd to give the World the following account, wherein I have faithfully related what pass'd on that occasion.

I was employ'd by the Honourable *Mr Boyle*, (and by him only) to borrow the MS of *Phalaris*, from *Dr Bentley*. After about Nine Months solicitation, it was deliver'd into my custody, without any time limited for the return of it. Within few days after, *Dr Bentley* call'd upon me, to have it restor'd, and Then told me, that he was to go into the Country. He staid till I sent to the Collator, and word was brought by the Messenger, that it was not collated. I then beg'd him to let me have it but till Sunday Morning, (it was Saturday Noon when he came) and I engag'd to oblige the Collator to sit up all Saturday Night, to get it finish'd. But he utterly refus'd to leave it with me any longer, demanding to have it sent that Day to Westminster, (which was done accordingly) and not giving me any the least hopes,  
that

that if I apply'd to him upon his return out of the Country, I shou'd have leave to get the Collation perfected. These Circumstances I am thus particular in, because I had occasion to recollect 'em not long afterwards, when Mr Boyle's Book came out, and Letters pass'd between him and Dr Bentley, concerning the Passage in his Preface.

It may not be proper, considering my Employment, for me to add an account of the Reflections Dr Bentley was pleas'd to make from time to time, when I spoke to him from Mr Boyle, for the Use of the MS. He has represented me as having said too much on that subject. But, by good fortune, Dr King was present at one of the Meetings, and heard all that pass'd there. I hope he will do Justice on this occasion.

July 13.  
1697.

Tho. Bennet.

I Very well remember, that Mr Bennet sent his Man to me for Phalaris's Epistles, whilst I was collating 'em; and being unwilling to part with them, before I had gone through 'em, I sent the Man back without them. But he presently return'd, and told me, that the Gentleman, that own'd them, staid at their Shop for them, and cou'd not spare them any longer: This is the true reason, why I cou'd collate no more of the abovesaid Epistles.

Witness my Hand,

July 15,  
1697

Geo. Gibson.

S I R,

**I** Am bound in Justice to answer your request<sup>d</sup> by endeavouring, as far as I can, to recollect what pass'd between Mr Bennet and Dr Bentley, concerning a MS of the Epistles of Phalaris. I cannot be certain as to any other particulars, than that, among other things, the Dr said, that if the MS were collated, it wou'd be worth nothing for the future: Which I took the more notice of, because I thought a MS good for nothing, unless it were collated. The whole Discourse was manag'd with such insolence, that, after he was gone, I told Mr Bennet, that he ought to send Mr Boyle word of it; that, for my own part, (I said then, what I think still) I did not believe that the various Readings of any Book were so much worth, as that a Person of Mr Boyle's Honour and Learning shou'd be us'd so scurvily to obtain 'em. That scorn and contempt which I have naturally for Pride and Insolence, makes me remember that, which otherwise I might have forgot. Believe me, Sir, to be

Your faithful Friend,  
and humble Servant,

*William King.*

*Dottors Com-  
mons, Octob. 13.*

1697.

The

The Case then between Me and Dr *Bentley* stands thus : There is, on the one side, Dr *Bentley's* single Assertion, in his own cause; and these several concurring Accounts, from Persons of Probity and Worth, on the other. The question now is (if it be a question) which of these ought to be credited ? the Point to me is so clear, that I dare trust the most partial Friend Dr *Bentley* has to determine it.

Mr *Bennet*, and Mr *Gibson*, I think, are so little interested in this Dispute, that they may be entirely depended upon. However, Dr *King* is a Witness without Exception; and the account he gives of one of those Free Conferences Dr *Bentley* held with Mr *Bennet*, is full and home; and I do assure our Learned Critic, that what ever becomes of *Phalaris's* Letters, this of Dr *King's* is not Spurious. I have the Original of it by me under his own hand, as I have the Originals too of the other Papers, which shall be at Dr *Bentley's*, or any man's service, that pleases to command a sight of 'em.

And now had I not reason to say what I did, and much more than I did, of Dr *Bentley*, in my Preface to *Phalaris* ? Could I resent the harsh Treatment he had given me in Gentler Terms than I there made use of ? Since he had denied me so common a favour, and spoken of me with so much contempt, I was at Liberty, I think, to have return'd his Civilities in what way I pleas'd ; and to have given him any Language whatever that it was not below me to give : And  
that

that is a Restraint which, I hope, I shall always be able to lay upon my self, whatever the Provocation be.

Dr Bentley then considering all things, was really oblig'd to me, for using him with so much Tendernefs. What way did he take of owning his Obligations? He immediately enter'd upon the Honourable and Christian Design of exposing me; and resolv'd, whatever Time or Pains it might cost him, to prove, that the Epistles I had put out were a ridiculous Cheat; and that I (or whoever the Editor was) was to be pity'd, for giving my self so much trouble about them. I see Monsieur *Rochfaucant* drew his Observation from Nature, when he said, *We often pardon those that injure us, but we can never forgive those that we injure.*

In about two or three years time he had achiev'd this mighty Work, and compass'd a Dissertation as big as *Phalaris* it self, to make his Point good. There, that he might be wanting in no Instance of *Humanity*, he tells the World, that the Edition of *Phalaris* was not mine, but only ascrib'd to me; and, be it whose it would, that 'twas a faulty and a foolish one: and then tells me too, in the same breath, that nothing of this was intended as a disparagement to me; to show his Reader, I suppose, that he had as mean an Opinion of my Understanding, as he had of my Learning. He names me not indeed, but in his civil way of Circumlocution, calls me, *That young Gentleman of great hopes whose Name is set to the Edition.* But what great hopes cou'd the World have had of a young Gentleman,



man, who shou'd have suffer'd the Lye to be publickly given him in a matter, where his Reputation, both as a Scholar and a Man of Honour, was nearly concern'd, and yet had either not Sense enough to discern the Affront, or not Spirit enough to resent it ?

Dr Bentley was not satisfied with giving me ill Usage, unless he did it in ill Words too ; and therefore he has cull'd out the very worst he cou'd find, to bestow on me : for surely no man of Liberal Education cou'd put together so many unmannerly and slovenly expressions without studying for 'em. He charges me with *Calumny* <sup>a</sup>, *weak Detraction* <sup>a</sup>, <sup>a p. 66.</sup> *Injustice* <sup>a</sup>, *Forgery* and *Slander* <sup>a</sup> ; with the *basest Tricks* <sup>b</sup>, and a *vile Aspersiō* <sup>b</sup>, He tells <sup>b p. 71.</sup> me, that a certain Person *tho' a sorry Critic, was yet a degree above me* <sup>c</sup> ; and, that *Printing is a Sword in the hand of a Child* <sup>d</sup> ; meaning, <sup>c p. 75.</sup> <sup>d p. 67.</sup> I suppose, his humble Servant.

He likens me, by a very elegant Simile, to a *Bungling Tinker mending Old Kettles* <sup>e</sup>, in one <sup>e p. 76.</sup> place ; and by the help of a Greek Proverb, calls me downright *Ass* <sup>f</sup> in another. The <sup>f p. 74.</sup> correcting the faults of my Version is, in his polite way of writing, *the cleansing of Augreas's Stable* <sup>g</sup> ; and, to carry on the Metaphor, <sup>g p. 73.</sup> he says, *The first Epistle cost him four Pages in scouring* <sup>h</sup>.

These are the Flowers, which Dr Bentley has, with no very sparing hand, strew'd throughout every Page almost of his Learned Epistle. It can hardly be imagin'd, how one, that lives within the Air of a Court, shou'd prevail with himself to deal in such dirty Language : the Chairmen at St James's, I dare

<sup>h</sup> *ibid.*

dare say, manage their Disputes with more decency. I find the Dr has not profited much by the dependence he once had on a *Great Man*, who might have taught him, would he have vouchsaf'd to learn it, the Secret of engaging deep with an Adversary; without Loss of Temper, or Breach of Good Manners.

But he will tell me, that few or none of these expressions were levell'd at Me; and that for a very obliging reason; because I am not included among the *Editors of Phalaris*. Let 'em have been levell'd at whom he will, they are inexcusable. Chew'd Bullets are not more against the Law of Arms, than such ways of speech are against the Rules of good writing.

Dr Bentley cou'd not have taken a better way of justifying me in what I said of him, than by writing in this manner he has done; and with so little of that *Humanity*, the want of which I objected to him. Most Readers will be apt to think, that he might probably always want it as much as they see he does now. So that if I needed further Vouchers than those which I have already brought, I wou'd call in his own Dissertation to witness for me, that I have not wrong'd him; nor given him any Character, but what he has since been courteously pleas'd to make good.

But Our Critic appeals from me to more Equitable Judges; and tells me, that he can produce several Letters from Learned Professors abroad, (whose Books in time I may be fit to read) wherein these very same words [pro singulari sua

suâ humanitate] are said of him seriously and candidly. For I endeavour (says he) to oblige even Foreigners by all Courtesie and Humanity; much more wou'd I encourage and assist any useful design at home.

But why must we go to Foreign Nations for a true account of Dr Bentley? I thought Mens Characters had been best learnt from those among whom they convers'd. The Law of England is, that every Man shall be try'd by his Country and his Neighbourhood; and this is not more reasonable in the Case of Life and Death, than in that of Reputation. But Dr Bentley pleads to have a Jury of Foreign Professors impanell'd to sit upon him: a very suspicious Defence, I think; and which ought, without any more ado, to condemn him. Shou'd a man tax'd with ill breeding here at London (where he has liv'd all his time) produce Certificates in his behalf from some Correspondents in Cornwall, or Cumberland, wou'd this Plea pass at Court? Granting Dr Bentley's Foreigners to have said those things of him which he says they have, 'tis because they are Foreigners; We, that have the happiness of a nearer conversation with him, know him better; and may perhaps take an opportunity of setting those mistaken Strangers right in their Opinions concerning him.

Thus much, upon the Supposition that he has these Testimonials by him: but I, who have had some dealings with him, have learnt a little to mistrust his accounts; and shall therefore, before I make any more Remarks upon this passage, tell the Reader a Story.

There

There was, not many Years ago, a Dispute about a Point of History, between an Ingenious Gentleman and a *Learned Prelate* of our Church, well know to Dr *Bentley*. When the Gentleman was at a loss for Proofs, his last resort was always to a certain Chest at *Ilcomkill*, where there were MSS, it seems, never seen by any body besides himself, that prov'd every thing he had a mind to. This presently put an end to the Controversie : for there was no disputing against Invisible Authorities. How far this may be Dr *Bentley's* case, and whether the Letters from Learned Professors abroad, which he talks of, may not lie in some such Chest as those Records lay in, I will not pretend to determine. However, since they are MSS, I know his Fondness for those precious Jewels so well, that I believe he'll be shy of making 'em publick. Till he does, the Printed Proofs that have been given of his great *Humanity* will stand good against what he tells us has been written to him.

Sure I am, there are some Learned Men abroad, that are far from Complimenting him. One of 'em, a Man of great note, has complain'd to me, how ill he has been us'd by him, in a case nearly resembling mine ; and complain'd in very expressive Terms ; which, not yet having his Leave for it, I do not think my self at liberty to publish.

Another, that was desirous to have a sight of the *Alexandrian* MS, and apply'd himself to Dr *Bentley* very earnestly for it, met with no other Answer to his Request, but that *the Library was not fit to be seen* : A pretty  
Ex-

Excuse for a Library-keeper to make, who had been four Years in that Service ! And this Instance of his *Humanity*, I assure him, is of no Old date ; it happen'd since he purg'd himself in his new Dissertation, and gave Learned Men encouragement to expect better usage.

If he goes on at this rate, as we have no reason to doubt but he will, Foreigners will begin to suspect whether we have, as we pretend, the *Alexandrian MS*, or indeed whether the King has any Library.

But because the Dr strongly argues from *his being ready to oblige even Foreigners by all Courtesie and Humanity*, that he would much more be ready to do so to *Learned Men at Home*, I will add one Domestick instance of his Courtesie too, that my Instances may be every way as large as his Assertions.

I have now a Letter by me under the hand of Sir Edward Sherburn, (a Gentleman of known worth and Learning) wherein he has these words ; *I have sent Rubenius's Book [de vitâ Mallii, put out by Grævius in Holland, and dedicated to Dr Bentley] the honour of whose Publication Mr Bentley hath ungratefully robb'd me of.* The meaning of this is explain'd in a Latin Memorandum enter'd by Sir Edward in the Book it self ; where he says, that he put the MS into Dr Bentley's hands, under this Condition, that he shou'd send it to Grævius to be publish'd, letting him know from whence he had it, and desiring him to make an honourable mention of him, as the person that had oblig'd the World with it. The Edition came out, it was dedicated to Dr Bentley,

ley, the honour of the Publication given to him; and not one word of Sir Edward Sherburn said in it. The Sophists are every where pelted by Dr Bentley, for putting out what they wrote in other Mens names; but I did not expect to hear so loudly of it from one that has so far outdone 'em: For, I think, 'tis much worse to take the honour of another man's Book to one's self, than to entitle ones own Book to another man.

But *Gravius*, it may be, was in fault: and forgot to do Sir Edward Sherburn justice. 'Tis hardly to be imagin'd he cou'd, had Dr Bentley told him plainly, that the MS was put into his hands under that express Condition: But if the Dr only gave some slight intimation of it, *Gravius* might indeed forget to do what he did not know whether it were in good earnest expected of him, or not.

But supposing the Original Omission to have lain wholly at *Gravius's* door, yet how came the Dr to be so very quiet under it afterwards? Why did he not send immediately to Sir Edward Sherburn to excuse it? Why did he not take care to have this Neglect repair'd in the next *Holland Journal*? Nothing of this was done; and therefore, shou'd the Dr not have been the willing occasion of the Mistake, yet at least he was very willing that it shou'd prevail.

Upon a view of this story, I am apt to retract my Suspicions about Dr Bentley's Letters from Learned Professors. He may perhaps have Testimonials of his Courtesie by him,  
if

if he sticks at no method of procuring 'em: By such Arts as these 'tis easie for a Man to get a Reputation of *Humanity* abroad, without deserv'g to be much commended for his Honesty at home. 'Tis an hard word, and which I should not easily allow my self to use, but that I think I may take a greater Liberty in another man's behalf, than in my own.

By Dr *Bentley's* way of treating Sir *William Temp'le*, Sir *Edward Sherburn*, and my self, one would imagine, that he had vow'd hostility to all Gentlemen pretending to Letters; that he thought they broke in upon a Trade, which none but those of the Body corporate of Profess'd Scholars ought to deal in; and so, looking upon 'em as the *East-India* Company does upon Interlopers, was resolv'd to use 'em accordingly.

By this time the Reader is able to judge, how far my Character of Dr *Bentley* suits him, and how far he might justly expect to have that Character publickly given him; whether his *Humanity* be *Singular*, or not, and whether my Opinion be *Singular* concerning it. I hope I have now set the *Matters of Fact* in a true light; I have only some few Remarks to add on some Passages in the Story which Dr *Bentley* tells of this matter, in which either his Memory, or his Sincerity fail'd him.

He begins his Account with a great (and I had almost said a wilful) Mistake: He says, I have told the World in my Preface, that I had Collated the King's MS as far as the 40th Epistle, and would have done so throughout, but

that the Library Keeper, &c. Whereas I told the World, not that *I had Collated that MS*, but that *I had taken care to get it Collated* : My words are, *Collatas etiam* [viz. *Epistolas*] *curavi cum MS° in Bibliothecâ Regiâ, &c.*

The Difference here, as slight as it may seem, is material ; and Dr Bentley, one may guess, was aware of it. He saw very well, that, unless I was represented as having collated the King's MS *my self*, he could not well lay the Mistakes of the Collation upon me ; which he was resolv'd however to do to the utmost, and therefore gave that convenient Turn to his matter of Fact at the Entrance, which might best serve to countenance his Criticisms that follow.

With this view, he makes an unfair and broken citation of my words in the Margin ; placing there only thus much out of my Preface, [*MS° in Bibliothecâ Regiâ, cujus mihi copiam ulteriorem Bibliothecarius, pro singulari suâ humanitate negavit.*] and taking no notice of the words that introduce these, [*Collatas etiam curavi cum*] without which the Sentence is imperfect, and unintelligible.

Dr Bentley cou'd not have given us a better Earnest of his Integrity, at his first setting out : The rest of his Account, we shall find is wrote with the same degree of Truth and Fairness. *The true Story* (says he) *is thus* : *A Bookjeller came to me in the name of the Editors, to beg (he would say, desire) the use of the MS.* He knows very well, that Mr Bennet went to him in my name only ; Mr Bennet himself is positive in the point : but least the



the Dr should deny it, I have, by good luck, preserv'd so much of his Letter by me, as relates to this Particular. There he was pleas'd to use these Civil Expressions: *Mr Bennet desir'd me to lend him the Manuscript Phalaris, to be Collated, because a Young Gentleman, Mr Boyle of Christ-church, was going to publish it. I told him, that a Gentleman of that Name and Family, to which I had so many Obligations, and shou'd always have an honour for, might command any Service that lay in my Power.* But now he says, that Mr Bennet came to him in the Name of the Editors. How came I to be multiply'd at this rate? unless he has recollected himself since, and remembers the little Circumstances of this Transaction better at two or three Years distance, than he did immediately after it happen'd.

He proceeds in his *True Story*.— *It was not then in my Custody; but as soon as I had the power of it, I went voluntarily, and offer'd it him.* What he means by its *not being in his Custody*; whether that he had lent it to some-body else, or that he was not yet fully enter'd on his Office, or that he had it not in his Pocket; must be a Secrer, till he pleases to explain himself. Whatever his meaning be, the Reader is desir'd to take notice, that there was about Nine Months Solicitation us'd to procure it: A longer time than he needed to retrieve it out of the Hands of Those to whom he might have lent it, or than the Ceremony of his Inauguration to his Library-keeper's Place cou'd require. I'm sure he was much nimbler with my Col-

lator ; for, instead of *Nine Months*, he would not allow him *Nine Days* time to peruse it in.

His next words are, *bidding him tell the Collator not to lose any time*, (which, translated into English, is, *bidding him let the Collator know, that he must not lose any time*) for *I was shortly to go out of Town for two Months*. This, I have reason to think, is pure Fiction ; Mr *Bennet* remembers nothing of it : but he very well remembers, that when the Dr came to demand the MS of him agen, he *then* told him, he was to go into the Country, and gave that for his reason why he could allow him no further time to collate it in. It was a mighty Treasure it seems, the Credit of the King's Library depended on the *Alexandrian* MS, and That ; and therefore he would not trust it out of those Walls a day longer. Besides, (which is a Circumstance, that tho' Dr *Bentley* has, yet Dr *King* has not forgotten) *had it been collated, it would have been worth nothing for the future*. This was an Objection not to be got over ; especially since Mr *Bennet* had no Orders from me to take the proper way of removing it.

It follows, 'twas deliver'd, us'd, and return'd ; not a word said by the Bearer, nor the least suspicion in me, that they had not finish'd the Collation. This is roundly averr'd ; but the Reader has Mr *Bennet's*, and Mr *Gibson's* Certificates ; and, after comparing 'em with this Passage, may believe as he thinks fit.

*Well,*

Well, (says he,) the Collation, it seems, was sent defective to Oxon, and the blame, I suppose, laid upon me. Does he only suppose it? Did not I positively write him word, that it was laid upon him, and so laid upon him, that I was oblig'd to take notice of it? But he is to be excus'd for forgetting what I wrote to him, when it appears, that he has forgot what He himself wrote to me.

After a few Months, out comes the new Edition, with this Sting in the mouth of it. 'Twas a Surprise indeed to find there, that our MS was not perus'd. Our MS! that is, His Majesty's and Mine. I thought indeed by the Price Dr Bentley set upon the MS, he fancied himself to have some Interest in it: He speaks out now, 'tis no longer the King's, but *Our MS*, i. e. Dr Bentley's and the King's in common: An Expression as much too familiar for a Library-keeper, as *Ego & Rex Mens* was for a Cardinal. I will not, for the future, so nicely observe his Indecencies, since I find he is so general and undistinguishing in 'em.

'Twas a Surprise indeed to find there, that our MS was not perus'd. Could they not have ask'd for it agen then after my Return? Yes, I could, Sir, and have been deny'd it again; which I was not very willing to venture. I neither thought my Self so Little, nor Dr Bentley so Great, nor the MS so considerable, that I should make a second Application for it, after such a Repulse; no, not tho' I had been sure of obtaining it. much less could I ever think of asking it

agen, when, by what Mr *Bennet* had told me I had all the reason in the World to think, I should be again deny'd it.

*But there is a reason for every thing*, (says the Dr) and the *Mystery was soon reveal'd*! A pretty decent Phrase on so light an occasion; but this is not the only instance, where the Critick has got the better of the Divine. Well, but how was the *Mystery reveal'd*? why, *He had the hard Hap*, it seems, in some private Conversation, to say, that the *Epistles were spurious, and unworthy of a new Edition: Hinc Illa Lachryme*. If he said this, as he intimates he did, at *Oxford*, where the Book was then printing, he said a very uncivil thing; and what, in his Dialect, he terms his *Hard Hap*, other People would be apt to call his *Ill Breeding*. However, I seriously declare I was utterly a stranger to this Discourse of his, till he told me of it in Print. I might hear, perhaps, of his being in *Oxford*; but I had heard too much of his Discourse with Mr *Bennet*, to be curious in making any Enquiries into his private Conversation.

The Reader will excuse this Tedious Descant on Dr *Bentley's* Relation of Matter of Fact. The true Story of our *MS* was a point of importance: my Honesty was concern'd in this part of the Dispute, the rest only touches my Learning. Having therefore, I hope, justified my Conduct where it most became me to do it, the Matters of pure Criticism will give me no concern, I'm sure, tho' they may put me to some little Trouble. I shall enter upon 'em with the indifference of a Gamester, who plays but for a trifle,  
which

which 'tis much the same to him whether he wins or loses.

I shou'd now fall closely to my work, the Authority of *Phalaris's* Epistles, but that there is an Introduction of *Dr Bentley's* that lies in my way, and must first have a Reflection or two bestow'd upon it.

He begins it with telling us, that *Mr Wotton*, by the power of a long Friendship between 'em, engag'd him to write it.

I hope *Mr Wotton* will let the Publick know, that he neither engag'd his Friend to write upon this Subject in this manner, nor approv'd of these Discourses, when written: which the World will presume him to have done, till the contrary appears; and till he has disclaim'd *Dr Bentley's* attempt as publickly, as he now seems to countenance and avow it. 'Tis a little strange, that *Mr Wotton* in a second Edition of his Book, which he had discretely taken care to purge of most things that look'd like ill manners in himself, shou'd be prevail'd upon to allow a place to the ill Manners of another man. But I hear, and I am not unwilling to think, that *Mr Wotton* receiv'd this Present at a venture from *Dr Bentley*, and let it be printed, without giving himself the trouble of reading it. And I the rather fall in with this account, because I find *Mr Wotton* in his Book \* zealously vindicating \* P. 415, the Age from the Imputation of Pedantry; & 416. and assuring us, that tho' the Citation of Scraps of Latin, and a nauseous ostentation of Reading were in fashion Fifty or Sixty Years ago, yet that all that is now in a great measure disus'd. Which, I suppose, he would never

ver have done in some of the last Pages of his Book, if he had then known of the Dissertation that immediately follows it.

A Gentleman of my acquaintance was observing to me, what a Motly, Unequal work, these two Pieces make, as they now lie together. Mr *Wotton* (said he) in his Reflections takes in the whole compass of Ancient and Modern Learning; and endeavours to show wherein either of 'em has been defective, and wherein they have excell'd. A Large Design, fit for the Pen of my Lord *Bacon*! and in the well executing of which any one Man's Life would be usefully spent! Dr *Bentley* comes after him with a Dissertation, half as big as his Book, to prove, that three or four small Pieces ascrib'd to some of the Ancients, are not so ancient as they pretend to be: a very inconsiderable point; and which a wise man would grudge the throwing away a weeks thought upon, if he could gain it! and what then shall we say of Him, that has spent two or three years of his life, to lose it? Mr *W's* Motive to write was, he tells us, a piece of Publick Service that he hop'd he might do the World; Dr *Bentley's* plainly a private Picque, and such as 'twas utterly unfit for him to act upon, either as a Scholar or a Christian; much more, as he was one in Holy Orders, and that had undertaken the publick defence of Religion. Mr *W.* (continued he) is modest and decent; speaks generally with respect of those he differs from, and with a due distrust of his own Opinions: Dr *Bentley* is Positive, and Pert; has  
no

no regard for what other men have thought or said, and no suspicions that he is fallible. Mr *W's* Book has a Vein of Learning running through it, wherethere is no ostentation of it : Dr *Bentley's* Appendix has all the Pomp and Show of Learning, without the Reality. In truth (said he) there is scarce any thing, as the Book now stands, in which that and the Appendix agree, but in commending and admiring Dr *Bentley* ; in which they are so very much of a Piece, that one would think Dr *Bentley* had writ both the one and the other.

But leaving these two Friends to the Pleasure of their mutual Civilities, I shall go on to the rest of my remarks on Dr *Bentley's* Introduction. After telling us then at whose Instance he wrote this famous Piece of Criticism, he begins to give us a cast of his skill in the Point. Sir *W. Temple* had observ'd in favour of the Ancients, that *some of the Oldest Books we have are the best in their kinds.* To this Dr *Bentley* replies, *That some of the Oldest Books are the best in their kinds, the same Person having the Double Glory of Invention and Perfection, is a thing observ'd even by some of the Ancients.* And for this he very learnedly quotes *Dion Chrysostome* : But then (says he) *the Authors they gave this Honour to, are Homer and Archilochus, one the Father of Heroic Poem, and the other of Epode and Trochaic, p. 7.* What he means by saying that this had been observ'd even by some of the Ancients, is not easie to apprehend, nor why he quotes *Dion Chrysostome* for it, whose Authority either in this, or any other case, is  
not

not very considerable ; and who besides does not say that for which he's produc'd : especially when there is an approved Writer more ancient than *Dion*, that has directly said that for which *Dion* is improperly brought. *Dion*, in the Oration quoted, after a tedious insipid Exordium about the different talents of praising and dispraising, takes occasion from thence to mention *Homer* as the famous Parent of *Panegyrick*, as *Archilochus* was of *Satyr* ; and prefers 'em to all others in their way. But he has not a word there about the *Oldest Books being the best in their kind*, or of the *Double Glory of inventing and perfecting* ; for which *Dr Bentley* gravely produces him. But tho' *Dion* says nothing of this, *Velcius Paterculus* does: *Non quenquam alium* (says he) *cujus operis primus Auctor fuerit, in eo perfectissimum reperiemus prater Homerum & Archilocum. Lib. 1 Cap. 5.* 'Tis a little odd, methinks, that *Dr Bentley*, who professes in this Piece of his to give Battel to Sophists and Sophistry, and to decry 'em as a company of illiterate Scriblers, should yet think fit to grace the very Entrance of his Work, with vouching the Authority of as errant a Sophist and Declaimer as ever was ; and with vouching him for what he really did not say ; and for what had been said by a much better hand, before him. But great Scholars have very particular ways with 'em.

*Dr Bentley* goes on : But the choice of *Phalaris* and *Ælop*, as they are now extant, for the two great and inimitable Originals, is a piece of Criticism of a Peculiar Complexion, and must proceed



ceed from a singularity of *Palate and Judgment.*

For *Æsop* it will be time enough to account, when I come to the entire Dissertation that concerns him. But as to *Phalaris's Epistles*, many learned men of different Ages and Countries, have been profess'd admirers of 'em; never any man, till the Judicious *Dr Bentley* arose, pretended to despise 'em: even those Criticks of late days, who suspected their being Genuine, yet allow'd 'em to be finish'd things in their way, and excellently well counterfeited. And therefore the value which *Sir W. Temple* professes for 'em cannot be said to proceed from a *Singularity of Palate and Judgment*: at least this ought not to be said by him, who but four Pages afterwards lets us know, that *Stobæus* esteem'd 'em so highly, as to insert some of 'em into his Judicious Collections; and that *Suidas* terms 'em Ἐπιστολὰς θαυμασιὰς πάνυ, most admirable Letters. *Sir W. Temple*, one would have thought, might have been secur'd from the imputation of Singularity by the concurring Judgments of two such men, for whom, we may be sure, *Dr Bentley* on any other occasion would have had a particular regard; the one an eminent Common-placer, and the other a no less eminent Dictionary-writer. 'Tis a pleasant Reflexion to consider that *Dr Bentley*, at the same time that he is passing this free Censure on *Sir W. Temple's Palate*, is himself advancing an Opinion contrary to the sense of all Mankind that had ever written before him. Will not a modest Reader, on this occasion,

casion, be apt to say, that both the *Critic* and the *Critic* too are of a *Peculiar Complexion*?

He forgets, I believe, when and where a certain Critic of our times maintain'd, that *Ovid* and *Manilius* were the only two Poets that had *wit* among the Ancients. A very extraordinary piece of Criticism! and which, doubtless, proceeded not from any *singularity of Palate and Judgment*! 'Tis just as if I should say, that Sir *W. Temple* and Dr. *Bentley* are the two best-bred Writers living; or, to put it into the Dr's more learned and polite way, That *Nireus* and *Thersites* were the only two *formose men* that repair'd to the *Seige of Ilium*. *Manilius* writes with just as much *wit* as Dr *Bentley* does with *modesty*: only the difference is, that *Manilius's* subject would not admit of *wit*; and therefore he might have it, for ought we know, tho' he did not show it: whereas Dr *Bentley's* subject, (which is generally *Himself*) does not only admit of *modesty*, but require it.

The rest of Dr *Bentley's* Preamble is taken up in giving us an account how spurious Books came to prevail upon the World. He says, *This was a practice almost as old as Letters; but that it chiefly prevail'd, when the Kings of Pergamus and Alexandria, rivalling one another in the Magnificence and Copiousness of their Libraries, gave great Rates for any Treatises that carried the names of Celebrated Authors; and this he proves out of Galen upon Hippocrates, de Naturâ Hominis.*

There

There are other Old Writers that tell this Story, and tell it more truly, than *Galen* did, tho' a Native of *Pergannus*. He positively affirms, in favour of the Point he is proving, that till the time of these Rival Princes, there was no such thing as a spurious Book in the World; which is neither true, nor agreeable to what *Dr Bentley* tells us in the case, that *the Practice of forging Books was almost as Old as Letters*. Here therefore, as before in the case of *Paterculus*, *Dr Bentley* should have contented himself with vouching apposite, tho' common Authorities; and not have gone out of his way to have fetch'd in a witness, that after all, speaks against him. But he loves to surprize and dazle his Reader: for who would expect to see a point of History sett'd out of a Physician?

I thought indeed Quotation had been the Dr's peculiar Province: and that either he could manage that to advantage, or nothing. But these two awkward Proofs out of *Dion Chrysostome* and *Galen* (the very first he has produc'd) have shook my opinion of him even in this Respect. As we go further, we shall see clearer what to judge of him.

I will detain the Reader no longer in the Approaches to our Argument, than till I have desir'd him to joyn with me in his thanks to *Dr Bentley*, for the Intimation he has given us of a certain Supplement to *Petronius* found at *Buda*. He does not, I suppose, mean that from *Alba Græca*, which any of his Dictionaries would have told him was Latin, not for *Buda*, but *Belgrade*: and therefore

fore I conclude, that this must be some new discovery, which Dr Bentley has had earlier notice of, than the rest of the learned World; and that in time he will oblige us with a further account of it.

DR Bentley having declar'd open War against *Phalaris*, and all his Party, and having in his own Opinion gain'd the Victory, thought that the more Captive Criticks there were to follow his Chariot wheels, the more glorious would his Triumph be: He begins therefore with giving us an account of the number and strength of the Enemy he engages. He tells us, that the Epistles have been admitted as Genuine, ever since *Stobaeus's* time; that he has quoted 'em thrice; that *Suidas* speaks of 'em with honour; and that *Tzetzes* has made large Extracts out of 'em. These three, I think, says he, are the only Men among the Ancients that make any mention of 'em\*. They are perhaps the only Ancients, whose testimonies are to be met with, in any of the Prefaces to *Phalaris*: but Dr Bentley methinks should have dug deeper for his materials, and consulted Original Authors. Had he done so he might have found, that they are mention'd too by (a) *Photinus* in his Epistles, that they are quoted by *Nonnus* (b) in his Historical Comment on St Gregory's *Invectives*, and by the (c) *Scholiast* on *Aristophanes*, that very

\* P. 11.

(a) Epist.

207.

(b) Ως δὲ

αὐτὸς ὁ

Φάλαρις

ἐν ἐπιστολῇ

πρὸς Περικλῆν τινα, &c. p. 144. (c) *Plut.* *verf.* 142. Καὶ ὁ Φάλαρις βέλεθε τὸ σῶμα ὑμῶν καταλῦσαι πόλεμον.

Scho-

Scholias, whom, one would think, the Dr, by his citing him so often (e), had thoroughly read. The latest of these is some Centuries older than either *Suidas* or *Tzetzes*. Indeed *Tzetzes*, who liv'd but in the 12th Century, deserves not to be call'd an Ancient; and Dr *Bentley* himself is of this mind in another part of his Dissertation (f), where he styles him a *Later Greek*. But it was convenient that he should be an Ancient here, and a Modern there, in order to the different Ends which Dr *Bentley* had to serve by him.

Besides these, there is another remarkable Quotation from the Epistles in *Stobæus*, which Dr *Bentley* has overlook'd; 'tis *Tit. CCXVIII.* where an entire Epistle of *Phalaris* is transcrib'd, as it is again in the Collection of *Antonius* and *Maximus* the Monks, which accompanies *Stobæus*. Had Dr *Bentley* had these Authorities in his view, he might with better Grounds, tho' not with more Assurance, have pronounc'd, that \* The Epistles have the general Warrant and Certificate for this last thousand years, before the Restoration of Learning. And thus far I can agree with him: but when he further assures us, that † All the Scholars of those Ages receiv'd 'em for true Originals; as willing as I am to hear any thing in *Phalaris*'s favour, I must beg leave to dissent from him; because I find One of those I mention'd (and Him a Scholar, I think if there were any in the Age in which he liv'd) speaking of 'em with some distrust: 'Tis *Phorius* I mean; who gives 'em indeed an extraordinary character, and prefers 'em to the

(e) P. 100, 117, 118, 119, 137, 140, 148. &c.

(f) P. 53.

\* P. 12.

† P. 11, & 12.

the Epistles of *Plato*, *Aristotle*, and *Demosthenes*: but withal intimates his Suspicions that they are not Genuine, when he calls 'em the

\* Ep. 207. \* *Epistles that are attributed to Phalaris*, and  
 Τὰς εἰς τὸν  
 λαὸν ἀνα- ascrib'd to † Brutus.

† Ib. αἱ  
 Βεῦτος ἐπὶ  
 γὰρ ἐστὶν. With these Ancients, he tells us, many  
 Moderns have concurr'd in Opinion; parti-

cularly, that *Fazellus* and *Jacobus Capellus*, two  
 very Learned Men, have asserted the credit  
 of the Epistles; and that *Selden* himself de-  
 pended on 'em so much, as to determine a  
 point of Chronology out of 'em. And now  
 what would a Modest man expect shou'd have  
 been Dr Bentley's end in reckoning up all  
 these great Mens Opinions, but to strengthen  
 and countenance his Own? whereas he brings  
 'em in, only to shew how impossible it was  
 for them to judge right, who had the mis-  
 fortune to live before him. In spite of what  
 the Learned men of so many Ages and Na-  
 tions have thought and said, Dr Bentley  
 knows (a), and will demonstrate (b), *Phalaris's*  
 Epistles to be spurious: Nay, he is very much  
 mistaken, he says, in the nature and force of his  
 Proofs, if ever any man hereafter, that reads  
 'em, persist in his Old Opinion of making *Phalaris*  
 an Author (c). I will own to the Reader, that  
 had these words offer'd themselves to me be-  
 fore I had been acquainted with Dr Bentley's  
 Manner, they would have given me some un-  
 easiness. *Phalaris* was always a Favourite-  
 book with me; from the moment I knew it,  
 I wish'd it might prove an Original: I had  
 now and then indeed some suspicions that  
 'twas not Genuine; but I lov'd him so much  
 more

(a) P. 64.

(b) P. 5.

(c) P. 13.

more than I suspected him, that I would not suffer my self to dwell long upon 'em. To be sincere, The Opinion, or Mistake if you will, was so pleasing, that I was somewhat afraid of being undeceiv'd. However, I ventur'd to try, whether the Dr's Proofs would overbear me with that weight of demonstration they threatned. I read 'em, I weigh'd 'em; and I found, to my satisfaction, that *Phalaris* might still be an Author, notwithstanding what Dr *Bentley* had said against him. Nay, I assure the Reader, that my doubts about the Authority of the Epistles, since I read Dr *Bentley's* Dissertation, are much lessen'd: and if he should write once more upon the Subject, perhaps the point would be clear to me.

His *Arguments* against the Epistles (they are to go for such, till I have prov'd 'em not to be Arguments) when taken out of the Confusion with which he has deliver'd 'em, may be distinguish'd into such, as affect the whole, or touch only those *Particular Epistles* from whence they are drawn. The first of these are of greatest Consequence; for if any One of 'em holds, the Authority of the Epistles is in danger: and I shall therefore, with Dr *Bentley's* leave, consider 'em in the first place. In order to come at any of these, I must overlook a great many of his Pages for the present; not without intentions of returning to 'em: for he has advanc'd nothing on this Subject, but what shall, in its proper Time and Place, have a thorough Examination.

The First of these *General Proofs*, that I meet with, (for I shall take 'em as they lie) is in the 12th. Paragraph, where the Dr objects

D

against

- against the *Dialect Phalaris* uses; who reigning in *Sicily*, and being, as he tells us (a), born there, should have spoken *Doric*, the prevailing Language of the *Island*; whereas he writes *Attic*, the beloved *Dialect of the Sophists*, in which they affected to excell one another even to *Pedantry and Solæcism* (b).

(b) P. 41.

Tho' it be no very material point, yet I cannot grant the Dr that the Language of the Letters is properly *Attic*. There are indeed several *Attic* ways of speech in 'em; but so there are in other Authors, who confessedly wrote in the *Common Dialect*. 'Tis one thing to mix *Atticisms* in one's style, and another thing strictly to write *Attic*; *Homer* did the one, *Thucydides* and *Plato* the other: however no body will say, that *Homer* wrote in the same *Dialect* with *Thucydides* and *Plato*. Dr *Bentley* has abundance of pure *Anglicisms* in his *Latin*, and *Latinisms* in his *English*; but he will not for all that be willing to allow, either that his *Dissertation on Malala* is in *English*, or that this on *Phalaris* is in *Latin*.

- Well, but supposing the Letters to be in *Attic*, what use does he make of this? why, he argues from hence, that they were written by the *Sophists*; who, he tells us, affected to excell one another in writing *Attic*, even to *Pedantry and Solæcism* (c) A very deep Reflection! so deep, that I must confess my self to be a little at a loss for the Meaning of it. The perusal of a late Author indeed has given me a clear Notion what it is to be affected even to *Pedantry*: but the being affected even to *Solæcism*, and in *Attic* too, is to Me, I confess, a very incomprehensible degree of

Af-



Affectation. I thought, the *Athenians*, of all the *Greeks*, spoke the most Properly, and Purely, and were the furthest remov'd from any suspicion of *Solæcism*; and that therefore no one could be guilty of it, while he spake as They spake, any more than a Man can stick strictly to the Language of the Court, and yet speak false English. But Dr *Bentley's* Notions of Language differ much from mine; and therefore 'tis no wonder if I do not apprehend him.

To let his *Flourish* pass then, and to come to his *Argument*; I will venture to say, that it is a *silly one*: and I make thus free with it, because it is *my Own*, and mention'd by Me, in my Preface to *Phalaris*\*, as

one of the Grounds I had to suspect the Authority of the Epistles; tho' I was far, even Then, from having that high Opinion of it Dr *Bentley* has, or thinking it to be Demonstrative Evidence: and the more I consider it, the less Weight I find in it.

\* Neq; cum Siculis Scripto-  
ribus placuerit semper Diale-  
ctus Dorici, Agrigentinarum  
(qui antiquitus Diores erant)  
Tyrannus aliâ uti debuit. p. 2.

For *Phalaris* was by no means oblig'd to speak *Doric*, on the account of his being a *Sicilian* born; for two good Reasons: because the Natives of *Sicily* (and so of other places) did not always write in the prevailing Dialect of their Country; and because *Phalaris* was no Native of *Sicily*. I shall dispatch this Last point first, because it will give us the least Trouble.

If the Credit of the Letters stands good, *Phalaris*, we are sure, was no *Sicilian*; Dr *Bentley* indeed says he was, and threatens to

† P. 44.

prove it from Good Authors †: but threatn'd History, as well as other threatn'd things, has the luck sometimes to live long; and so it has happen'd in the present point: for the Dr, notwithstanding his Menaces, has not, throughout his Dissertation, said a Syllable to shake it.

(2) In  
Greg. In-  
ve. p. 2.  
143.

I can help the Dr indeed to One Author, that speaks something to his purpose; and Him an Old Scholiast too, which will please the Dr the better: *Nomius* (a) says, that *Phalaris* was by birth a *Sicilian*; but he gives this, together with some other Impertinent and Ridiculous Accounts of him, which he there confutes. This is all I can at present do for the Dr in the matter; and as little as it is, it is more than the Dr has done for himself.

But whether *Phalaris* were of *Sicily*, or no;

(b) *Astypalea*, a City in  
*Crete*, never mention'd before  
by any Geographer. Dissert.  
P. 44.

Our Diligent Editors made  
this Discovery in Geography;  
for it could not be learnt any  
where else. Dissert. p. 58.

the Dr is positive (b), that he was not of *Astypalea*, a City in *Crete*, as I have represented him. And upon this fancied mistake of mine he is very merry and throws out a great deal of awkward Drollery; which, had there

been an Occasion given for it, would, let me tell him, have but ill become a Man of his Gravity, and a Reader of Old Scholiasts: but as it is founded purely on a Mistake of his own, is somewhat the more unseasonable, and unbecoming. For, after the Dr's fit of Mirth is over, I wou'd ask him seriously, how he comes to impute the Discovery of this new City in *Crete* to me? do not the Epistles them-

themselves plainly suppose it ? and does not He himself grow wise enough, or sincere enough, by the 58th Page, expressly to own that they do so ; and save me the trouble of proving it ? I have the same Authority to say that *Phalaris* was born at *Astypalea* in *Crete*, as that he was born at any place of that Name. And what has the Dr to oppose to it ? why, he assures us, that there was no such City in *Crete*. Has he then a List of all the *Hundred Cities* there ? if he has, 'tis a compleater one by far than *Proxeny's* ; and a mightier Discovery in Geography, than that of mine, with which he so ingeniously diverts himself. He should however have had some Wisdom in his Mirth, and have look'd about him, before he resolv'd to be positive. Had he done so, he wou'd have found, that both

*Go'tzius* (a) and *Fazellus* (b)

made this Discovery before me : the Last of these Dr *Bentley* has vouchsaf'd to call a very Learned Man (c) ; and I'll venture to call the Other so. So that if I did mistake, I mistook after Great Names: and Dr *Bentley* is unpardonable,

for not knowing, or not owning what One of these had said ; for he quotes (d) the very Page in *Fazellus*, where the Words I have produc'd from him are. If he had read it, as well as quoted it, he could not have miss'd 'em ; They stand so fairly in the Front of *Fazellus's* short account of *Phalaris*, that they must needs have star'd him in the Face. I will not be so rude as to call the Dr a

(a) Hist. Sicil. & Mag. Gr. ex Numism. p. 126. *Patre Cretenfis, Urbe Astypalide.*

(b) Rer. Sic. Dec. 1. L. 6. C. 1. *Phalaris Crete Insula Urbe Astypalide ortus.*

(c) Dissect. p. 12.

(d) Dissect. p. 12.

*Second-hand Critic* ; but the Reader may judge how far he has given me an occasion to do it.

\* Diff.  
p. 44.  
But no *Geographer*, he says, *has mention'd this City in Crete* \*. He speaks unwarily ; I will suppose, he means, no *Old* one. No more have they several of the other *Ninety Nine* : which nevertheless were as surely there, as if half a dozen *Geographers* had given us the Names of them. It is enough for my purpose, that the Letters have mention'd this *Astyralaa*. If Dr *Bentley* will discard all Places, that occur but once in Ancient Writers, he'll make mad work in *Geography*. What does he think of *Trinacia*, the *Sicilian* Town in *Diodorus* ? † what of the *Kasis* *χασίς* mention'd by *Scylax* ? where else does he meet with 'em ? He'll say, they are corrupt Readings, perhaps : but the MSS agree in 'em. No matter for that ! while the MSS are for Him, he is for Them ; and no longer. And therefore to shorten the Work, and save my self, and the Reader, the trouble of more Instances, I'll put the Dr in mind of what the Learned *Palmerius* says upon this passage in *Scylax* : *The Name of this Place, or Region, says he, occurs no where, that I know of, but here. Nevertheless, this is not a sufficient reason why we should quit the word : for how many Places, how many Regions were there, of which there is but a single, or no mention made in the Authors that have come down to us ? Does the*

*Ejus Loci  
seu Regiuncula alibi  
quod sciam  
non fit  
mentio.  
Sed ideo  
forte non  
est exter-*

*minanda ex hoc loco Vox. Nam quot Loca, quot Regiuncula fuerunt, quarum Autores, qui ad nos usque devenerunt, vel semel, vel nunquam fecerunt mentionem ?*

Dr think, because *Astypalea* was an Island among the *Cyclades*, and among the *Sporades*, that therefore it could not be a Town any where else? Is not this just the Case of *Naxos*, which was an Isle among the *Cyclades*, and yet a Town in *Crete*, and in *Sicily* too? *Strabo* mentions *Astypalea* a Promontory in *Attica*, another Promontory of that name in *Caria*; a third *Astypalea*, the ancient Metropolis of the Island *Cos*: and why might there not be an *Astypalea* in *Crete* too?

I have dwelt too long on this point; however I cannot yet part with it, till I have done right to the Learned Greek Professor of *Cambridge*, whom Dr *Bentley* takes upon him to correct, without the least Ground or Colour of Reason: to shew, I suppose, that he was Impartial; and resolv'd to bestow his Good Manners, as he had done Himself, upon Both Universities.

Mr *Barnes* would have the Island *Astypalea*, where he supposes *Phalaris* born, to be that among the *Cyclades*. Dr *Bentley*, allowing *Phalaris* to have been born in the Island *Astypalea*, yet says it must be that among the *Sporades*; for this convincing Reason; because this Latter was nearest to *Crete*, whither *Phalaris's* Wife and Son are suppos'd to have fled. Ep. LXIX \*. Giving the Dr Leave to suppose \* P. 44. this Flight from *Astypalea* to *Crete*, why must it needs be from the *Astypalea* that was nearest? Those that fly are usually glad to get as far as they can out of the reach of their Pursuers. But now even the Flight, upon the Supposition of which this fine Reasoning turns, is it self a Fiction. For neither in that

Epistle which the Dr quotes for this, nor in any other Epistle, is any such Flight mention'd, or suppos'd, or in the least intimated. Was it worth his while to forge this little Piece of History, only in order to contradict his Betters? Is the Pleasure of inventing a Circumstance, meerly to be made with; an Equivalent to the shame of being told on't?

But he has found the Professor in another Mistake, as Material as This, and as well made out. Mr *Barnes* had call'd the Island *Astypala*, and not *Astypalæa*; and the Exact Dr *Bentley* therefore is so kind, as to inform him how it should be spelt. A little share of Good Nature would have made the Dr suspect an Error of the Press in this case, if there had been any Error; and a little more Reading than he has, would have taught him, that there was no Error in it: for the Professor call'd the Island but as *Scylax* (a) had call'd it before him. On both these accounts, the Dr might have spar'd his Criticism: and so he would probably, but that Mr Professor had been guilty of a Fault not to be forgiven by *Gratuitously undertaking to Apologize* (b) *Dissert. for the Epistles of Phalaris* (b), in his Elaborate Edition of *Euripides*: that is, (for I can make no other sense of it) by defending the Authority of the Epistles, *without having any thing for his Pains*. This looks as if the Dr thought Learned Men were to set a Price upon their Civilities, and never part with a Favour till they had their Fee.

But to return from our Digression; Let us allow the Dr what he contends for, without any manner of Proof or Reason, that *Phala-*

*ris*

(a) *Asv-*  
*πυλα.*

(b) *Dissert.*  
*p. 44.*

his was a *Sicilian* born: will he infer from hence, that it was necessary for him to write in *Doric*? That I can never allow him. For we have Instances without Number, of Authors writing in a Dialect different from that of their own Country; and not a few Instances of *Sicilian* Writers, who laid aside the *Doric*: and why then should *Phalaris*, a Prince, and a very Arbitrary and Lawless one, be confin'd to it? *Agathyrhides*, the Historian of *Samos*, had he follow'd the Dialect of his Country, would have written in *Ionic*; and *Chrysermus* of *Corinth*, in *Doric*: and yet both of 'em writ in the Common Dialect, as appears by the Extracts out of 'em, preserv'd in *Stobæus*. So did *Andronicus*, the *Rhodian*, who paraphras'd some part of *Aristotle*, and *Dionysius* the *Halicarnassian*; tho' both *Rhodes* and *Halicarnassus* were Cities of *Dorian* Original. *Herodotus* was of the same place with *Dionysius*, and yet made the *Ionic* Dialect his choice; as *Hippocrates* of *Cos*, a *Dorian* Town also, had done before him. *Rhianus*, and *Epimenides* were both probably *Cretans*: that the First of these wrote not in the particular Dialect of *Crete*, we are as sure, as that the large Fragment ascrib'd to him is His; that the Latter did not, we have reason to think from the short Citation out of him in *St Paul* (a), where we find the Common word *αἰς* employ'd instead of *αἰε*, which the Grammarians tell us (b) was peculiar to the Inhabitants of that Island. *Alcaeus*, *Sappho*, and *Simonides*, were born in places where the

(a) Κεῖται δὲ λευκὸν, καὶ ὄψια, γαστέρας ἀγροί.

(b) *Joh. Philop.* } *de Dialectic.*  
*Corinthus,*

*Ionic* was spoken, and yet writ their Lyric Poems in *Æolic*, or *Doric*. Dr *Bentley* indeed pretends in some measure to account for this, by saying, that the *Lyric* (or, as He loves to speak, the *Melic*) Poets chose the *Doric Dialect* for the sake of the *Doric Harmony*, which was fitted to That, and to the Nature of the Ode: but why then did not the rest of the *Lyric Writers* chuse it too? It wou'd have become *Anacreon's Odes*, every whit as well as *Sappho's* and *Archilochus's*, as well as either: and yet both *Anacreon* and *Archilochus* wrote in *Ionic*. So that no sure Rule can be fix'd, or holding Reason given, for the Ancient Writers departing from the Idiom of their Country: Historians, Moralists, Philosophers, and Poets of all sorts practis'd it at pleasure; chusing such a *Dialect*, as either pleas'd their own Ear, or the Ears of those for whose sake they wrote,

(a) This probably was the Case of *Callimachus*, in his Hymn upon the Baths of *Pallas*, compos'd by him in *Doric*, to compliment the *Argians* (or *Argivans*, as Dr *Bentley* new names 'em, p. 82): tho' the same reason will not hold for his Other *Doric Hymn*, dedicated to the honour of *Ceres*: nor can any reason, I believe, be given for it, but what will equally prove, that he ought to have written the rest of his Hymns in *Doric*.

and whom they endeavour'd to please (a); or such, as they thought suited best with their Subject: and very often they took up with that *Dialect*, which was in Fashion among the Polite Writers of the Age in which they liv'd. For, that there was a *Fashion* in *Dialects*, and that the chief of 'em had severally their Course and Period, in which they flourish'd, may (not to mention other Proofs of it) be gather'd from a Passage in *Dionysius Halicarnassaus*; where he says of the Old Greek Authors, that they chose



chose the *Ionic Dialect* to write in, as being that which was most in *Vogue* in their time (c). I suppose

this only as *probable*; Dr Bentley would have said it was *demonstrable*. But no man

(b) "Οἷτε τῶν Ἰάδα ὡρε-  
λόμενοι Διαλέκτου, τὴν τοῖς  
τότε χεῖνοις μάλιστα ἀνθα-  
σαν" *Dion. Hal. in Thucyd.*

should be *Dogmatical* in Cases of this Nature, where several other Circumstances, besides the vast distance of Time, concur to make the Subject obscure; where all is but a *Lucky Guess*, and he that is most Learned must, if he be fair, confess that he has but a very dim and uncertain Light to see by.

It will then be very hard upon our *Sicilian Prince*, to deny him a Liberty, which Writers of all sorts, and of all other Countries and Times have taken: and it will be harder still, if we consider, that this is what has been done often, even by *Sicilians* themselves *Diodorus* and *Empedocles* are famous Instances of this kind; the one in *Prose*, and the Other in *Verse*: *Archimedes* the *Syracusan's* Works do not all equally partake of the *Doric Idiom*; some have more, and some have less of it, as they were written sooner or later; and his *Treatise of the Sphere and Cylinder*, the most remarkable part of his Works, least of all.

To come yet closer to our point: We have a Letter writ by *Dion* of *Syracuse* to *Dionysius* Tyrant of that place, and part of another † written by *Dionysius* himself; both preserv'd among the Epistles of *Plato*; where there is not the least shadow of *Doricism*: but as well the Prince, as the Philosopher, have written their Epistles in such a *Dialect*, as if (to use\* *Differ.* Dr Bentley's Gentleman-like Phrase) they had gone to School at Athens \*.  
Nay

† *Plat.*  
Epist. 7.  
*Dionis*  
*Cognatū.*

P. 43.

Nay some of the Princes and States of *Sicily*, and other Dorian Countries, have caus'd *Coins* to be struck, whose Inscriptions are not in pure Doric. Abundance of Instances of this kind are to be met with in *Goltzius*, *Paruta*, and *Harduin* : I shall give the Reader a Taste of them in the Margin \*.

\* Δραχμῆς  
βασιλέως  
ἱερωνύμου

βασιλέως. Εὐσταρχῆς ἱερῶν αὐτῶν, a *Cretan* money; in some other Inscriptions it is Εὐσταρχῆς ἱερῶν, the Inscription of a Coin, belonging to *Velia*, a Town in *Magna Græcia*.

But the most remarkable Instance of all is that of *Zaleucus*, King of the *Locrians*, a Doric Colony; the Preface to whose Laws is preserv'd in *Stobæus*, an exact and faithfull Copier of Old Authors, and has plainly nothing of the Doric Dialect in it. *Diodorus Siculus*, who does not so strictly transcribe, but chuses rather to weave things into the Phrase and Body of his History, has the same Preface, with some Alterations; but none, that make it more Doric than it is in *Stobæus*.

And now, upon a View of these Instances, (and others of this kind, which I could produce; but I spare the Reader) I might bespeak the Dr in his own pert way of Enquiry; *Pray, how came Attic* (or any other Dialect but the Doric) *to be the Court Language at Syracuse? How came Zaleucus, and Dionysius the Tyrant, so to doat on the Dialect of a Democracy (a)?* How is it, that those Little Princes of *Sicily*, as Arbitrary and Jealous of their Prerogative as the Mightiest Monarch whatever, allow'd of Inscriptions on their Coins, which were not in the Language of their Country

(a) Diff.  
p. 41.

Country? Any clear Solution that he shall please to afford us of these matters will equally serve to give us an account, why *Phalaris* too might be excus'd from writing in Doric.

The Dr indeed has endeavour'd to prevent me in some part of the Evidence that I have brought; and has excepted against such Instances as those of *Empedocles*, and *Diodorus*, whose Case, he says, is widely remote from that of our Tyrant. The former being to write an EPIC POEM, shew'd an excellent judgment in laying aside his Country Dialect for that of the Ionians; for the Doric Idiom had not Grace and Majesty enough for the Subject he was engag'd in: being proper indeed for *Mimes*, *Comedies*, and *Pastorals*; where Men of Ordinary Rank are represented, &c. but not to be us'd in HEROIC, without great disadvantage (a).

(a) Differ.

I desire Dr Bentley to inform me, in what Old Scholiast, or Manuscript Author, he has met with this Curious account of *Empedocles*'s writing an *Epic Poem*: as much out of the way as he loves to read, he'll be hard put to't, I believe, to find an Authority for it. If he can, 'tis plain he knows more of *Empedocles*'s Works than *Laertius* did; who has been so absurd, as to inform us particularly of several less considerable Pieces of his, and to pass over altogether in silence this *Epic Poem*. Dr Bentley will be pleas'd, at his leisure, to produce his Vouchers in this point; which I am apt to believe he will do, at the same time that he lets us know where the *Buda MS* of *Petronius* is to be met with. *Empedocles* wrote many things in Hexameters indeed; but Dr Bentley

Bentley sure cannot be so wretchedly ignorant as to think, that every large Copy of Verses written in Hexameters, is an *Epic Poem*. Aristotle would have inform'd him, that *Empedocles* was so far from being an *Epic Poet*, a Poet of the first Rank, that he scarce deserv'd the Name of a Poet at large: *There is nothing*, says he, *that Homer and Empedocles agree in but their Verse*; and therefore Homer indeed may

\* Οὐδ' ἐν κοινὸν ὄντι Ὀμήρου  
ἔμπεδοκλέῃ πλὴν τὸ μέ-  
τρον, δι' ὃ τὸν μὲν Ποιητὴν  
δίνουσι καλεῖν, τὸ δὲ φυσολό-  
γον μᾶλλον ἢ Ποιητὴν. Poet.  
c. 1.

justly be call'd a Poet, but *Empedocles* rather a *Naturalist*, than a Poet \*. Or if Aristotle be too good a Book for Dr Bentley to converse with, there is a Writer of less size,

Comp. of  
anc. and  
mod. Lear.  
p. 32.

even his Friend Mr. Wotton, who would have taught him the Distinction between *Philosophical* and *Epical Poems*; that is, such as *Empedocles* and *Lucretius* wrote on the one side, and *Homer* and *Virgil* on the other. He who is so nicely severe upon *Phalaris*, for confounding μέλας and ἐλεγεῖν (b), should have taken care not to have given *Phalaris's* Friends an Opportunity of making Reprisals. The Fatal Mistake in this case was, that *Suidas*, the Dr's Oracle, calls him ἐπικοιδης, which strictly taken, signifies an *Epic Poet*, but in it's loose sense a *Versifier* only; and the Dr was not at leisure to take notice of this distinction.

(b) Differ.  
p. 59.

And if *Empedocles* did not write an *Epic Poem*, how did he shew his Judgement in laying aside his Country Dialect? Could not *Physics* have been as Judiciously wrote in Doric Verse, by Him, as in Doric Prose by *Ocellus Lucanus*, and the rest of the *Pythagoreans*? His Treatise

tise

tise of *Expiations* (a), why would it not have (c) Καθα-  
 born being written in Doric, as well as *Theocri-* *μοί.*  
*tus's Pharmaceutria*? especially since *Laertius*  
 intimates, that the Subject of that Treatise  
 was in great measure drawn from the *Pytha-*  
*goraeans*: would it not properly then have been  
 compos'd in the Dialect those Philosophers  
 us'd? We have several small Remains of  
*Empedocles*; but not a Line of his in Doric.  
 We have a Large Fragment of his directed  
 to the People of *Agrigent*, his Townsmen:  
 did he shew his Judgment in laying aside his Coun-  
 try Dialect there too, when he was directing  
 his Verses to the very People of his Country?  
 Had the Doric Idiom not Grace and Majesty  
 enough for the Subject he was engag'd in, when  
 the Subject was no higher than an Account of  
 Himself to his own Countrymen? If Doric  
 be proper for *Mimes*, *Comedies*, and *Pastorals*,  
 where Men of Ordinary Rank are represented, why  
 is it not as proper for little Poems, where  
 Men of ordinary Rank are address'd to? I  
 believe it would puzzle a Man of less Sagaci-  
 ty than *Dr Bentley*, to tell us, for what rea-  
 son *Empedocles* us'd Ionic, but because he had  
 a mind to't; and may not the same reason be  
 urg'd also in behalf of the Attic of *Pha-*  
*laris*?

*Dr Bentley* has had very ill Luck in bring-  
 ing off the Poet, let us see whether he has bet-  
 ter in what he has to say for the *Historian*.

\* *Diodorus Siculus*, he tells us, and the other \* P. 50.  
*Historians of Dorian Nations*, had great reason to  
 decline the Use of their Vernacular Tongue, as im-  
 proper for History; which besides the affectation  
 of Eloquence, aims at Easiness and Perspicuity, and  
 is

is design'd for General Use : but the Doric is Course and Rustic, and always clouded with an Obscurity. The Reader cannot but observe in this Passage the particular Beauty and Happiness of the Dr's Expression : but it matters not much how he Writes, let us consider how he Reasons.

If the Dr's Solution be just, how came Archimedes, and the Pythagorean Naturalists, and Moralists, not to decline the use of their Vernacular Tongue, as well as the Historians ? They all, I dare say, aim'd as much at Perspicuity ; and the Last of the Three, doubtless, design'd their Treatises as much for General Use. I will not say indeed, that they affected Eloquence ; because I do not think that a good Character, whatever Dr Bentley may : but, which is much better, they were Eloquent, very Lofty and Magnificent, and withal very Clear in their Expression ; on both which accounts they are recommended by Dionysius Halicarnassensis \*, to be read by

\* Μεγαλοπρεπείς ὅδ' τῇ  
λέξει, καὶ ποιητικοί· καὶ ἐν δὲ  
ὁμιλίᾳ σιφίνεσαν. T. 2.  
P. 70.

all those that desire to write well. And his Judgment in this Case is the more to be valu'd ; because He wrote ex-

cellently well himself, and with great Perspicuity.

'Tis true, as the Doric Dialect grew out of Use and Request, their Writings grew less Easie and Perspicuous ; and Porphyry had reason therefore to attribute the decay of the Pythagorean Sect to the Use, or rather to the Decay of that Dialect : but without dispute the Doric, in its flourishing days, had the same degree of Clearness as the rest ; and the  
Phī-

Philosophers, that writ in it, design'd their Works to be of as General Use, and to last as long as those of the Historians. So that Dr Bentley has assign'd no Reasons for the Historians not writing in Doric, but what will serve as well to prove Others not to have writ in it, tho' we are sure they did: a Way of arguing, worthy his Adventurous Pen! and which nobody, I believe, will envy him the honour of!

Hitherto I have been proving against Dr Bentley, (I hope not without success) that *Phalaris* was under no obligation of writing Doric, tho' he had been a *Sicilian born*: much less was he oblig'd to write it, upon the account of his Living among the *Agrigentines*, or Reigning over them, as Dr Bentley pretends. *He was a Publican* (says the Dr) *or Collector of Taxes; could not that Perpetual Negoce and Converse with the Dorians bring his Mouth to speak a little broader*\*? P. 46. No doubt it *could*; and perhaps it *did*: but the Question is, whether, notwithstanding his learning Doric, he might not retain another Dialect with it; and speak it, and write it at his pleasure? But would not He that aim'd at *Monarchy*, and for that reason design'd to be *Popular*, have quitted his *Old Dialect* for that of the place, and not by every word he spake make the *Invidious Discovery* of his being a *Stranger*? The Dr forgets that every one of *Phalaris's* Epistles were written after he was a *Tyrant*: He might, for ought we know, speak Doric before he got into Power; but afterwards there was no need of courting the People, for he govern'd by his *Blue-coats*†. And I think he † P. 93. could not have taken a more proper way of shewing his Tyrannical Temper, than by  
E throw-

throwing off the Language of the Country, and using a Foreign Dialect in all his Dispatches. *The Conqueror* is suppos'd to have done much the same thing by Us, when he chang'd the Language of our Law; and he shew'd himself in nothing more a Conqueror, than by doing it.

\* P. 41.

But the Dr has urg'd, that *Phalaris*, being such a Tyrant, would not probably have been fond of the Language of a Democracy, that was eminently *μειστότατος*, an hater of Tyrants\*. Was not Doric too the Language of the *Lacedaemonians*? and did not they hate Tyrants, as much as the *Athenians* themselves? At this rate, *Phalaris* could not have spoken any Dialect of the Greek Tongue, for every one of 'em was the Language of a Democracy, somewhere or other. If the Dr's Reasoning be right indeed, it may happen to prove that the Epistles are not Genuine, because not written in *Persic*: but it will never prove 'em Spurious, because they are not written in Doric. After all, what Trifles are these to amuse us with? that *Phalaris*, to be sure, would not speak Attic, because the *Athenians* in his time drove out *Pisistratus*? Would I give my self leave to Declaim at this rate, might I not with much better colour say, that *Phalaris* would, to chuse, make use of that Dialect; because it was the Language of *Pisistratus*, his Brother Tyrant? I see Dr Bentley loves no less to argue, than read out of the way; and it is so much out of the way, that I am asham'd to follow him.

Were I so very a Critic, as to love Wrangling rather than Truth, I might further dispute it with the Dr, whether Doric were the



the Language of *Agrigent*, or no, and that upon no less an Authority than *Strabo's*, who expressly says, that *Agrigent* was a Colony of the *Ionians* (a): And Monsieur *Ménage* (b) rely'd upon this so far, as to account from hence for the Ionic of *Empedocles*. However, I must freely own my Opinion, that this Passage is corrupted, and that we ought to read Γελῶν instead of Ἴωνων, according to the account which that most Exact and

Faithful Writer *Thucydides* has given us; not to mention *Polybius*, and the *Scholiast* on *Pindar*. And this Conjecture is the more probable, because *Strabo* seems to be speaking there of Colonies drawn from one part of *Sicily* to another; such as that from *Syracuse* to *Camarina*, which he mentions in the words immediately foregoing. I wonder how this escap'd the most Learned and Acute *Casaubon's* observation. Not to insist upon this therefore; but allowing Dr *Bentley*, that *Agrigent* was a *Dorian* Town, as I believe it was; allowing him, that *Phalaris* was even born there, if he pleases, or in any other Town in *Sicily* that he shall pitch upon, as I believe he was not: and allowing further, that *Phalaris* was oblig'd on this account to speak *Doric* as long as he liv'd, yet still I have One Question to ask the Dr; How can he prove, that *Phalaris* did not write *Doric*? 'tis true; the Epistles at present are not in that Dialect: but they might have been Originally in it;

(a) Καμαρίνα πόλις Ἰωνοῦ Συρακυσίων, Ἀκράδας δὲ Ἴωνων L. 6. p. 272.

(b) Certe ut erat Arigentum Ionum Colonia, teste Strabone, Agrigentini, licet Siculi, (qui quidem Siculi Diores erant) Ionico sermone forsar utebantur. Notæ in Diog. Laert. l. 8. sect. 60.

\* P. 49

and afterwards, upon the disuse of that Dialect, have been turn'd out of it into the Ordinary Language, at the Fancy of some Copyer before the Days of Stobæus \*. This the Dr has irrefragably prov'd, in the very Article we are upon, to have been the case of *Ocellus Lucanus's* Book, *περὶ τῆς τοῦ Πανδύου φυσικῆς* : and why may it not have been the case too of *Phalaris's* Epistles ? If some Copyer, since *Stobæus's* time, thought that *Ocellus's* *Physics* would look better out of Doric, than in it, and therefore transdialected 'em ; why might not some other Copyer, before *Stobæus's* time, think the same of our Tyrant's Letters, and do the same to 'em ? and why, after this was done, might not the Original *Phalaris* be lost, as well as the Original *Ocellus* ? It is certain, *Stobæus* thought that this might so happen, or at least, that *Phalaris* might not have written Doric originally ; for he transcribes several of his Epistles into his Excellent Work, in the very Language we now find 'em, without imagining in the least that they could not be Genuine ; because they were not in Doric. Such a Consequence as that never enter'd into his Head : He had met with several *Sicilian* Writers, that chose to write out of the Dialect of their Country ; particularly *Empedocles*, an Author of the same Town with *Phalaris* : (He had not indeed met with any *Heroic Poem* of his ; that Lucky Hit was reserv'd for the Inquisitive Dr Bentley) and he had met also with some Writers, whose works were at first in all probability penn'd in Doric, and yet were in another Dialect in his time : for instance, the Pieces of *Perietyone*, and  
Ari-

*Aristoxenus*, two *Pythagoreans*; and who very probably wrote Doric, because they were *Pythagoreans*; and yet in *Stobæus's* time it is plain, that some part of the Writings of the One were in Ionic, and those of the Other (if I remember right; for I have not *Stobæus* now by me) in the Common Dialect. Let Dr *Bentley* then take which side he pleases; either that *Periclyon*, and *Aristoxenus*, (and I will add *Zalencus* too, who we are sure was a *Pythagorean* also from very good Authority \*) either, I say, that these *did* write originally in Doric, or that they *did not*. If they did, then we have instances in 'em of Ancient Authors transdialected very early, long before the days of *Stobæus*; if they did not, then here is a plain Proof that Authors (all probably) of Doric Countries (to be sure Two of 'em were) might nevertheless not write Doric: and either of these being granted me, the Reader sees, there will be no difficulty in justifying the Dialect of *Phalaris*. Indeed if the Last be granted me, it will be pretty difficult to justify Dr *Bentley's* hardy assertion, that the *Pythagoreans* would sooner have lost their Lives, than have written out of Doric (a); and that, if they had done it, it is most certain they would have been banished the Society (b). And therefore Dr *Bentley*, I suppose, to make himself Consistent, (a very hard Task!) will choose rather to grant, that these Writers were originally in Doric: and if they were, he will please to consider, how they got out of it; and shew us, why *Phalaris* might not get out the very same way.

\* Porphyrius  
Vita Epik.  
p. 15.  
Diod. Sic.  
l. 12. p.

(a) Differ.  
p. 47.  
(b) Ibid.  
p. 48.

And here I should take my leave of this tedious Article, but that I hear Dr Bentley crying out *Eugeua*, and calling loudly on the Learned World to listen to a mighty Discovery. He undertakes to prove, that Ocellus Lucanus *did not repudiate his Vernacular Idiom, nor compose his Book* [αὐτὸς τοῦς τῷ πατρίδῳ ἑσπέρως] *in the Dress that it now wears, but in his own Country fashion* \*; that is, in plain English, that he did not write it in the Common Dialect, as 'tis now extant, but in Doric. Upon this the Dr spreads his Plumes, and swells beyond his usual pitch: *I dare engage to make out, and, If I may expect Thanks for the Discovery,* are Expressions that carry in 'em an Extraordinary Air of Satisfaction; and seem a little too Pompous for the Matter they introduce, were it entirely New, and his Own; but they much less become it, considering it is all taken, Word for Word, out of a Preface to an Edition of *Ocellus*, as I shall now shew the Reader.

\* Dissert.  
P. 47.

*Vizzanius*, above fifty Years ago, put out *Ocellus*†; and in his *Prolegomena* to that Piece, has said every thing that Dr Bentley has produc'd on this Subject, to a Tittle; and (which is a little unlucky) has said it almost in the very same Words too: only Dr Bentley is in English (I compliment him when I say so) and *Vizzanius* is in Latin. The Dr has condescended to translate that Honest Editor's Preface, without making the least Improvement of a single Argument there, but not without worsting several; and has the Modesty after that to take it all to Himself, as the Inventor; and to talk higher of this

† Bononiae  
1646.

this Petty Larciny of his, than *Vizzanius* did of the Original Discovery; which he thought too Obvious to value himself upon. Perhaps Some, who have not the Opportunity of comparing this Editor with *Dr Bentley*, may be glad to have a Particular Account of the Dr's Ingenuity in the matter: and therefore I shall take the trouble of going through all he says on this point, and plainly shew, whence he had his Intelligence.

I find (says the Dr \*) it was agreed and co-<sup>\* Differt.</sup>  
venanted among the Scholars of that Italian Sect, <sup>P. 47.</sup>  
ὅτι καὶ ἡμεῖς τῇ παλαιᾷ (Jambl. Vit. Pyth.) I can  
tell him, where he found it, it was in *Vizza-*  
*nus*: who says the same thing, and quotes  
the very same Authority for it. *Id certe as-*  
*serendum crediderim Ocellum Doricâ Dialecto*  
*suum Opus conscripsisse, tum quia Pythagoræos*  
*quoslibet illi studuisse comperio, tum quia id Py-*  
*thagoræ suadent Instituta, qui semper Idiomatum*  
*Græcorum Doricum maxime voluit sectari, tum*  
*antiquius, tum etiam præstantius illud arbitratus*  
*teste Jamblicho, in Vita Pythag.* Indeed he  
makes no such Inference as *Dr Bentley* does,  
that the Pythagoreans would sooner have lost their  
Lives, than have broken this Agreement; and  
that 'tis most certain, if anybody had publish'd a  
Book against that Injunction, he would have been  
banish'd the Society: because he knew, this was  
not observ'd by *Empedocles*, nor by the Au-  
thor of the *ἡρώδης*, nor even by *Jamblicus*,  
while he is writing this Account of the Pytha-  
goreans; no, nor by *Pythagoras* himself, if *Dio-*  
*genes Laertius* may be credited.

'Tis true, *Vizzanius* speaks a little unwarily; and he undertakes to intimate, that the Use of this *Ἑλληνισμός* among the Italian Sect was from the institution of *Pythagoras* himself: a Mistake, which, if he were in, he was probably led into by too slight a perusal of *Jamblichus*. Dr Bentley took all he found there for his Own, and this Mistake among the rest; and when he had it, to make it look the more like his Own, gave it the Confident Turn. Immediately these *Instituta Pythagoræ* grew a solemn Injunction of *Pythagoras*\*, which the Dr talks as familiarly of, as if he had seen a Copy of it. But methinks he might have infer'd, that there was no Injunction of this kind, from what he himself had told us out of *Jamblichus* but Three Lines before; that this Use of the Dialect proceeded from a Covenant and Agreement among the Scholars† themselves: For they who know what an Implicit regard was paid to *Pythagoras's* Orders by all his Scholars, will easily agree, that there could be no need of their entering into a Compact, to do any thing that He had commanded. Dr Bentley's Adversaries may be as severe upon him, on the account of his Criticisms as they please: but they needs must allow him to have a Particular Talent at Reasoning; and to have thus much at least of a Good disputant, that he is sure to make the most of his Argument.

Dr Bentley's next Suggestion is this; *We are assur'd that the other Pieces of this Author were made in Doric, as one of Law and Νόμος, cited by Stobæus. Vizzanius* too cites this Fragment of *Ocellus's* Piece *ἑὲς Νόμος*, from *Stobæus*; and

\* P. 47.

† P. 47.

and makes the same Use of it : Ocellum scil. Lucanum scimus Librum de Legibus scripisse — hujus fragmentum exhibet Stobæus — Doricâ Dialecto expressum, &c.

Dr Bentley goes on: But, which is plain Demonstration, Four Citations are brought by the same Writer out of this very Book,  $\varphi\iota\tau\eta\varsigma\tau\epsilon\pi\alpha\lambda\delta\epsilon\varsigma\kappa\upsilon\sigma\epsilon\alpha\varsigma$ ; all which are in Doric, and not, as they are now extant, in the Common Dialect: Vizzanius refers us to these four very places as they lie in Stobæus, and observes too that they are there in Doric: not, as they are now extant in the Common Dialect. De cæteris tandem in hoc Ocelli Opusculi contentis quis dubitet? Si enim primum respiciamus Caput, textum ejusdem ultimum; si secundum caput, textum sextum; si tertium caput, postremam textus quarti partem, & textum quintum & sextum; iisdem servatis vocibus, mutatâ licet Dialecto, ad amissim veluti Ocelli dogmata describit Stobæus.

From hence Dr Bentley argues, that this Tract of Ocellus now extant is to be acknowledg'd for a Genuine Work; which HITHERTO Learned Men have doubted of from this very business of the Dialect. So does Vizzanius, in the passage before quoted; and agen, Grave Stobæi Testimonium, non perfunctoriè, sed summo studio veteris monumenta sapientiæ semper lustrantis illud [Opus de Lege] ab Ocello prodiisse dubitare non sinit; & tamen Dorico Idiomate videmus conscriptum, cujus nec minima in hoc [ $\varphi\iota\tau\eta\varsigma\tau\epsilon\pi\alpha\lambda\delta\epsilon\varsigma\kappa\upsilon\sigma\epsilon\alpha\varsigma$ ] opere conspiciuntur vestigia: idcôq; an vere Ocellus autem hoc opus conscripserit, jure quæcumque suspicari contingat — hinc tamen certa potius quibus illi operi fides conciliatur, erumpunt argumenta. The only difference between Vizzanius

ZANIUS

zaninus and Dr Bentley upon this point, is, that *Vizzanius* does not triumph over the mistakes of those that went before him; nor tell us that All the Learned Men of Latter Ages had doubted whether the Work were Genuine, even when he might perhaps have said this safely and truly: Whereas Dr Bentley says it, fifty Years afterwards; and assures the World, that *HITHERTO* Learned Men have doubted of this matter, at the very time that he is Translating a Learned Man, who was so far from doubting of it, that he was giving Reasons, why No-body should ever doubt of it hereafter.

Dr Bentley concludes his Whole Argument thus; Now We see by these Fragments, that every Word of the True Book is faithfully preserv'd; the Doric only being chang'd into the ordinary Language, at the Fancy of some Copyer, since the Days of Stobæus. *Vizzanius* does not speak quite so strongly as the Dr; but he gives much the same account of it: *Quis dubitet de hoc Opusculo, cum viderit eosdem quos retulit Stobæus textus iisdem quidem omnino verbis, at diversâ Dialecto, Doricâ scilicet conscriptos? —indèque tenui ac facili immutatione Ocelli Opera ad Atticam traducta Dialectum?* and in the Words before quoted [*Hinc certa potius, &c.*] He answers the Cavils of those who suspected *Ocellus* from his Dialect, and handsomely turns their own Arguments against them. But I must give Dr Bentley his Due, and own he has here made some Improvement: for *Vizzanius* never thought of carrying this Argument so far as to prove, that because these few Fragments cited by *Stobæus* exactly agree with *Ocel-*



*Ocellus*, as we now have him; therefore 'tis certain, that every Word of the True Book is faithfully preserv'd. This was a Consequence reserv'd for Dr Bentley, which a Common Critic, who reasons but like other Men, would never have thought of: and it being the only one which he has produc'd of his Own on this Occasion, I should not be just to him, unless I fairly told the World, that he *did not borrow it*.

And now, why don't the Critics, Great and Small, rise up to do him Homage? How many Letters can he produce, from Learned Men abroad, who have paid him their acknowledgments for this Information? What has he to say for himself? can he pretend not to have seen this Edition of *Ocellus*? how came he then to hit just upon all *Vizzanius* says, and no more? has he not seen the *Amsterdam Edition* of Dr Gale neither? To what purpose does he think that Dr Gale set those Four Passages out of *Stobaeus* before his Edition, but to let People see that his Author was Genuine, and writ in Doric? He did not indeed make a Stir with that matter in his Preface, because he knew that *Vizzanius* had exhausted the point before Him; and he thought it not fit for him to take the humble and dishonourable Task of transcribing another Man's Labours, either with, or without naming him.

I am glad of this Opportunity of mentioning the Worthy Dean of York, and of paying my Publick Acknowledgments to him, for the particular Kindness and Favours I receiv'd from him, while I was under his Care. The  
Foun-

Foundation of all the little Knowledge I have in these matters was laid by Him; which I gratefully own: for I think my self oblig'd to let the World know, whom I have been beholden to; tho' Dr Bentley, I find, be of another Opinion.

And now I think I may without Vanity say, that I have outdone Dr Bentley in the way of *Discovery*: for Mine, as inconsiderable as it is, is a *Discovery*; and such an one, as proves His to be None.

FROM the particular *Idiom* of Speech which *Phalaris* us'd, Dr Bentley has prov'd nothing but this, that he can Construe a Latin Preface, take a Learned Man's Notions, and calmly put 'em off for his own; and then imperiously summon in the Men of Letters to do Obeysance to Him, as the Discoverer: all which I, and his Readers would readily have allow'd him, without putting him to the trouble of proving it. Having therefore thus strenuously manag'd the Argument of the *Dialect*, he now turns his Formidable Pen to another kind of Proof: He has found out, that the *Greek* even of that *Dialect* is more *Modern* than the Times of *Phalaris*.

His Arguments on this Head are so far from making any thing to his purpose, that one would imagine he brought 'em only as so many Instances to illustrate what he said in the 13th Page, that Men have been deceiv'd in their Conjectures of this nature, even to Ridicule. For, could he make out what he aims at, and produce some Expressions from these Epi-

Epistles, that are not us'd by the Ancient Greek Writers, what would he infer from hence? that these Words were certainly coin'd since the Age of *Phalaris*? how does he know but that they might be then in use, and dropp'd afterwards when the Learned Age came on; and reviv'd again, as that declin'd? *Horace* thought such Changes and Revolutions in Speech not unusual: and it might easily be prov'd, that there have been many such, both in the Greek and Latin Tongue; but that *Dr Bentley* has made the Proof of it superfluous here: for he has not produc'd any One Word, that is of that New Stamp he pretends. And among all the *Marks and Moles* (a) which he says, *betray the Epistles to* (a) *Differ. be a Thousand Years younger than Phalaris* (b), p. 52. he has had the Judgement to chuse out such, (b) P. 52. as betray Him to be as little a Critic in the Greek Language, as he is in his Own.

He has so propos'd his First Instance, that He and I shall have no Dispute about it in This Place: *προτρεπω*, in the sense of *accusing*, is, he says, *an Innovation in Language, for which the Antients us'd προτιπω*. I entirely agree with him, 'tis an Innovation in Language, and a very Modern one; so Modern, that I suspect 'twas first broach'd by a *Little Greek*, that writ towards the latter end of the 17th Century: (whom I shall not forget to talk with on this score, when I find his Criticism in its Proper Place, among the *Faults of the Versio.*) and consequently I apprehend the Epistles to be in no danger from This Word; but the next seems to carry Terror in it. For the *Dr* declares,

clares, that προδεδωκτα, which in the XVIIth Epist. must signifie, *having given before*, was never so us'd by the Ancients, but always for *having betray'd*. And this is one of the Instances that is to bring down the Date of the Letters a *Thousand Years* lower than their pretended Author. Let it have its force, to the Confusion of Phalaris, and all his Adherents: but what shall we do for St Paul? He comes far within this Period; so that the Writings that carry his Name must be Four hundred Years Younger than we Christians suppose 'em: and the Epistle to the Romans could not be the Genuine Work of that Apostle, but was penn'd (as Phalaris's Epistles were) by some more Recent Sophist, whom Dr Bentley has detected and unmask'd by the word *αρεδωκεν*, employ'd to signifie, *he gave before*; [Rom. xi. 35.] but never us'd in this sense, till many Ages after our Saviour. What shall we say to this? Shall we allow Dr Bentley to be a Scurvey Critic, or shall we in Tenderneſsto his Honour, give up our Bibles? Perhaps the Dr may, for this once, be mistaken: and I'm the rather inclin'd to think he is, because I find *αρεδιδωμι* and *αρεδosis* us'd in the very same sense by the Best Writers of Anti-

quity: Xenophon (a), Demosthenes (b), and Aristotle (c); if the Oeconomicks by his.

φειλόμενον

(in margine rectius *αρεφειλόμενον*) ἀπέδωκε, ἢ ἐπιμνωδὲς ἀρεδωκεν ὥστε τὸ στρατευμα πολὺ αρεθυμώτερον εἶν. Which Leunclavius rightly translates, *Præterea Cyrus & Stipendium prius illis debitum persolvit, & menstruum aliud ante tempus numeravit.* Xen. Hellen. l. i. p. 441.

(b) — μιμνήσκμεν & ναύτας ὥς ὅς τε ἦν ἀρίστους δωρεὰς ἢ προδόσεις δὲς ἐκείνῳ μεγάλας. Orat. εἰς τὸς Πολυκλ.

(c) — ἐπεὶ το αὐτῷ ἦν ὡς ἰ αὐτὸν εὐπορίαν, ὥς πῶς προδεδωμένῃ τρίμηνον σιταρκίαν δωρεὰν αὐτῷ δίδωας. Oecon. l. 2.

These

These are Great Authorities; but if they should prevail with the Dr to withdraw this Argument, we are not yet safe; he has still a stronger Objection against the Epistles of St Paul, and Phalaris, taken from the word *διώκω*, put for *following*; which, he says, anciently signified to pursue, when that which fled fear'd and shunn'd the Pursuer. What pity 'tis, the Knowing Dr Hody had not learnt this Secret Piece of Criticism sooner? how easily might he have prov'd the Septuagint of a much less Authority, and Later Date than Vossius contended for, by that Expression in *Ezra* (ix. 4.) πᾶς ὁ διώκων λόγον Θεοῦ? by which however the LXX, I suppose were far from meaning, every one that persecutes the Word of God. *Διόκω*, as I remember, is us'd once only by Phalaris in this sence; but I am sure 'tis frequently so employ'd by St Paul; and Remarkable it is, that in one Passage of his Epistles the Word is taken both in Phalaris's following, and Dr Bentley's persecuting Sence, within the Compass of two Lines: φιλοξενίαν διώκοντες. Ἐυλογεῖτε τοὺς διώκοντας ὑμᾶς. *Rom.* XII. 13, 14. Now let Phalaris shift for himself; but I am agen concern'd to put in one word for our Apostle. Would Dr Bentley give himself Time to consider, he would find, that *διόκω*, in all its various acceptations still implies the Notion of *Following*: sometimes the Thing follow'd has reason to fly and fear the Follower; and then it signifies to pursue in Dr Bentley's sence: but sometimes the Thing follow'd is less shy and timorous; and then it signifies barely to follow. Theocritus says,

\*Α αἰξὶ καὶ κύνων, ὃ λύκος τὰν αἶγα διώκει.

Now tho' the *Kid* might be afraid of the *Wolf*, yet the *Cytifus* is not so apt to run away from the *Kid*: and *Virgil* therefore, who understood the force of a Greek Word as well as *Dr Bentley*, translates it thus,

———*Lupus ipse Capellam,  
Florentem Cytifum sequitur lasciva Capella.*

where the Word *sequitur*, which is of itself Indifferent, is, as the Greek Word διώκει is in *Theocritus's* Verse, determin'd to signify differently by the several things to which it is apply'd. In much the same sence it is us'd by *Aristotle*, throughout his *Ethicks*, wherever he has occasion to express a pursuit after Honour, Riches, Pleasure, Virtue, and many such Objects, which are under no fearful apprehensions of the pursuer. If *Dr Bentley* be not yet convinc'd, I refer him for his farther

satisfaction to *Plato* (a), and *Dionysius Halicarnassens* (b); and I desire him particularly to consider those Words of *Xenophon*, in the *Memoirs of Socrates*, ἥρην τὰς οἰαιτίας φεύγον, καὶ τὰς ἐυγνώμονας διώκειν, which, according to the little Skill I have in Greek, is to be translated thus; *We ought to fly the*

*Men of a Troublesome Temper*; and to court the *Candid*. But if διώκειν here signified to persecute,

(a) Ταῦτα ἔν, ὃ Κίβης,  
( 'Tis *Socrates* speaks) Εὐ-  
λωῶ φράζει, καὶ ἑρμηνεύει, ὅτι, ἂν  
συνεργῇ, ἐμὲ διώκειν ἀπειμὶ  
ὥς τοῖς, τήμερον κελεύουσιν  
τὸ Ἀθλιωταίῳ. Phæd.

(b) Ολίγη ὕστερον ἐδίωκεν  
εἰς τὴν πόλιν. *Fausinus*  
followed *Romulus* into the  
City. P. 52.

*cite*, then *καὶ*, which is oppos'd to it, would signify *to court*; and so indeed we should have a Precept for Courting Dr Bentley.

He instances again in these words, *παίδων ἔραται*, which in one of the Epistles are meant to express *Lovers of their Children*; whereas says he, *this of Old would have been taken for a Flagitious Love of Boys*; and he would argue from thence, that this use of the word must be introduc'd by some Modern Sophist. Now to Me the Argument seems to lie quite the other way; and since the words *παίδων ἔραται* and *παιδερασταὶ* were, in latter times, of such infamous usage, 'tis not to be imagin'd, that a Sophist should put 'em into Phalaris's Mouth, to express *the Love of Children*: but 'tis very conceivable, that this in Phalaris's time might be an innocent Expression; tho' afterwards, as Greece grew lewder, it had a Double Meaning, and was therefore not fit to be us'd. I'm sure, I can give a better reason for my conjecture than the Dr can for his; and it is this: Whenever Phalaris has occasion to express the *Scandalous Love of Boys*, he does not use this word, as Later Authors do; he calls *Lycinus* (Ep. IV.) *αἰνόν ἐν παισὶ*, but not *παιδεραστῶν*; which if the Word had then born as Vile a sence as it did afterwards, he would probably have done: for he had a little of Dr Bentley in him at that time, and was bestowing the very worst Names he could think of upon his Adversaries. Besides, *παίδων ἔραται*, and *παιδερασταὶ* sound very differently; and if we take the Whole Sentence in Phalaris together, *πᾶσι τοῖς παῖσι τοῖς ὄντις ἔραται τοιοῦτος πόθος ἔκ ἐργῶν εἰς τέχνην*, the Connexion plain-

ly shews, that *παίδων ἐρασὶ* can have no ill meaning. Nay, long after *Phalaris's* time, we have Instances where these Words are employ'd in a Vertuous Sence: *Plato* uses 'em so almost every where; particularly in his *Συμπόσιον* they recurr often, and under a Chaste meaning \*, if *Plato's* own word may be taken for it. If *Dr Bentley* thinks otherwise, and dares say so, I leave him to be scourg'd by *Mr Norris*, and the rest of the *Platonists*.

\* Πάντως  
μὲν ὁ τοιοῦ-  
τος παῖδε  
ρασὶς τε καὶ  
φιλερασῆς

γίνεται, ἀλλ' τὸ εὐχρηνὲς ἀπαρτίζομεν, &c. says one of the Persons in that Dialogue — Who immediately afterwards professes, that he meant not these Words of a *Lascivious Love*: *ἰδὲ γὰρ ἂν δόξαις τὰ τ' ἢ ἢ ἢ ἀρροδισίων σωκυρίσας, ὡς ἄρα τὰ τε ἐν καὶ ἐτέρῳ ἐτέρῳ χαίρει ξυνῶν οὕτως ἐπὶ μεγάλης σπασίης· ἀλλ' ἀλλὰ π βαλομένη καὶ ἀτέρῳ ἢ λυγρὴ δύλη ἔστιν, &c. p. 192.* In the same manner τὰ παιδιὰ, which generally had a Scandalous Sence, is by *Plato* often us'd in a Good one: particularly in his *Phædrus*; where *Socrates* calls *Lysias* the Orator *Φαίδρου τὸ παιδικὸν*, *Phædri Delicia*, because of *Phædrus's* admiring and delighting in *Lysias's* Orations. See. p. 236.

Till I am at leisure to look out for more Authorities, I hope *Plato* may be thought considerable enough to countenance *Phalaris* in the use of this Expression: but the *Dr* has still a Proof in reserve, which he takes to be the most distinguishing Mark of a Late Writer. *Θυγατέρες* (Ep. CXLII.) is us'd for *Maidens*: this, he says, is a most manifest token of a *Later Greek*; even *Tzetzes* interprets it *Θεραπείνας*: that is, (if I can make any Sence of what he says) this Use of the Word is so modern, that even *Tzetzes's* himself was asham'd so to employ it, and therefore put *Θεραπείνας* instead of it. But if *Tzetzes's* Judgment may go for any thing, he's of my side; for he cites the *Epistles* as Genuine: and therefore to be sure did not substitute *Θεραπείνας* in the room



room of θυγατέρας, because he thought this sense of the word Modern. And here again I must put the Dr in mind of his Bible. For in the LXX we find, πάλαι θυγατέρες ἐκτρέψαντο παῖτον, (Prov. xxxi. 29.) where θυγατέρες must mean Women, or Maidens: But these Maidens were Some-body's Daughters; and so, I suppose, were those that Phalaris presented to his Friend. The same Expression recurs too in the Evangelists, where they tell us what our Saviour said to the Woman that touch'd the Hem of his Garment; St Matthew has it, ἔλπετε θυγατέρες, ἢ πῶς οὐ σῶσινέ σς; and St Mark, θυγατέρες, ἢ πῶς οὐ σῶσινέ σς. I need not go farther for Instances, since 'tis probable that this Criticism is altogether founded on a mistake; and what we now read θυγατέρας in the modern MSS of Phalaris, was in the more ancient ones contractedly written δερας, which might be read either θυγατέρας, or δεσποινας, as the Copyer chanc'd to hit upon it. Tzetzes therefore might truly read, and not interpret it δεσποινας; and (as it has often happen'd in Other Cases) this True Reading, which is corrupted in the entire MS of the Author, be preserv'd in this cited Passage of him. If our great Dealer in MSS did not observe this, where is his Sagacity? If he observ'd it, without owning it, where is his Sincerity? He must give me leave now and then to ask him an Insulting Question; He has ask'd me a great many. But I have One Enquiry more to make of him on this occasion; and that is, Whether he thinks, that his Philosophical Lectures serve more to the establishment of Religion, than his Criticisms do to overthrow it? For is he not Positive, that the Idioms of the Letters prove them to be

*a Thousand Years later than Phalaris?* And are not some of these very Idions frequently to be met with both in the *Gospels* and *Epistles*? Should not so Profound a Græcian and Divine as He is have look'd a little into the New Testament, before he had pronounc'd such rash and groundless Assertions? Could Men imagine One, who writes at this rate, to have any Meaning, they would think he had a very ill one: but the whole management of this Controversie clears him from all suspicions of Meaning and Design.

These are all the *Marks of Novelty*, which he has given himself the trouble to take notice of; *They that will search*, he says, *may find more of this sort*: without question they may; but if they don't find some of *another sort*, they'll have the Discretion to keep their Discoveries to themselves, and not expose 'em to be corrected by every one that can turn an *Index*,

or a *Lexicon* (a). By such Helps as these, 'twould be easie to collect Authorities in abundance against every Instance that Dr Bentley has brought on this head: but I am so far from valuing my

(a) *Nec sanè quisquam est tam procul à cognitione eorum remotus, ut non Indicem certè ex Bibliothecâ sumptum transferre in Libros suos possit. Quint. Instit. l. 10. c. 1.*

self upon a multitude of Quotations, that I wish there had been no occasion for those few I have produc'd; and think I am oblig'd to excuse my self to the Reader for that mixture of Latin and Greek, with which I am forc'd to vary this Odd Work of mine. I can only say, that I have been as sparing in this way as Dr Bentley would give me leave to be: and I have the rather avoided being tedious upon the Particular Point in debate between us,

us, that I might have room to examine the General Reflection which he has made upon the Change and Decay of Languages.

*It is easie (says the Dr) from the very turn and fashion of the Style to distinguish a fresh English Composition from another a hundred Years old. Now there are as real and sensible Differences in the Greek; were there as many that could discern them. But very few are so vers'd and practis'd in that Language, as ever to arrive at that Subtily of Taste.* I can easily grant, that <sup>\* Differ.</sup> the English Tongue has undergone very considerable and surprizing Changes, especially in this Last Century; till about the middle of which, we did not in good earnest set about the Cultivating and Refining it: and then carried our Improvements so far, that Some who wrote at the beginning of this Century are not now easily understood. At our best, We are perhaps a little too fond of adopting Foreign Words; and fancying, out of a Modesty peculiar to our Nation, that we have not stock enough of our own, are continually borrowing from our Neighbours: and this brings a great many New Phrases in upon us, and consequently antiquates a great many others. Besides, we have few things in our Tongue writ with any tolerable Degree of perfection; and They therefore who would write or speak well, have no Patterns to look up to, no sure Rule, but the present Mode of the Age, to guide themselves by: and as fast as That alters therefore, the Manner of writing must alter along with it. But now, if Dr Bentley pretends to point out as *Real and Sensible Differences in the several Ages of the*

*Greek*, as a moderate Critic may in the *English*, I'm afraid his *Subtilty of Taste* will fail him. Does he take the *Greek* of *Lucian* to be as different from that of *Plato*, as our *English* Now is from that which was spoken soon after the Conquest? Are not *Homer* and *Oppian* much nearer one another in their Language than *Chaucer* and *Cowly*; tho' in Time they are far more distant? No body is so absurd as to say, that the *Greek* Tongue did not admit of some few Alterations in Every Age: but 'twas incomparably the most fix'd and enduring of any that we are generally acquainted with: and I shall offer at Some Reasons, that gave it this remarkable advantage over other Languages. 'Twas early improv'd and adorn'd by Men of the greatest Genius that ever appear'd in the World; they polish'd and perfected it to that degree, that it was admirably fitted to all the Purposes of Speech, and Ways of Writing imaginable: They wrought it up into all the Majesty and Grace, all the Sweetness and Smoothness that an Happy Composition of Words, an Harmonious mixture of Vowels, Diphthongs, and Consonants, or a Just Cadency of Syllables could give it. The best *Greek* Writers had generally Skill in Music; which was infus'd into 'em from their Infancy, and none were reckon'd well-bred that wanted it. This made their Ear just, and fine: and the fineness of their Ear easily slid into their Tongue; model'd their Speech, and made it Tuneable. They brought all the Learning in the World into their Language; and wrote in the best manner, upon all the most usefull and pleasing Subjects, that could bene-

benefit, or entertain Mankind. The Natural Perfection of their Tongue, and the distinguishing Excellency of their Authors in all Kinds of Knowledge, and Ways of Writing, made 'em a Compleat Standard and Model to other Nations, and after-Ages; upon which every one endeavour'd to form himself: So that what was sure always to be lik'd, could not chuse but last long. Their Empire also did not a little contribute to the Stability and Prevalence of their Language; They overcame a great part of the World, and extended their Tongue by their Conquests, as they had done before by their Commerce. All Nations borrow'd from Them, but They had that Contempt of the Barbarity of other Countries, that they were shy of suffering either their Manners, or their Speech to be introduc'd among 'em. This Pride they preserved in a great measure, even when the *Roman* Empire was at its utmost heighth; and while *Rome* flourish'd with the Glory of Arms, the Seat of Learning still continu'd at *Athens*. This kept the Language so far entire and unmix'd, that we have *Greek* Books writ by Authors at almost Two thousand Years distance, who disagree less in their Phrase and Manner of Speech, than the Books of any Two *English* Writers do, who liv'd but Two hundred Years asunder. This then was a Peculiar Happiness of the *Greek* Tongue; No other Language, that has been of known and familiar use in the World, not even the *Latin* itself, enjoy'd any thing like it. An 150 or 200 Years was the utmost Length of Time that the *Latin* Purity continu'd. And therefore,

to Compare the Greek, the most Holding Tongue in the World, with the English, the most Fickle and Fleeting of any; and to *Infer* from the observable difference between the several Ages of English, that there was as great a Difference between the several Ages of Greek; is a *Comparison* and an *Inference*, which No-body, but Dr Bentley, would have allow'd himself to make: that is, (to be plain with him) No-body but One, who has no true Relish, no nice Taste of the Beauties and Proprieties of Either of these Languages; or of any Other, that he has yet pretended to judge of, or to write in. By those *Marks and Moles of Novity* which he has pointed out in the Paragraph we are upon, the Reader is by this time satisfied, how able he is to assign to every Greek Writer his proper Age and Period, meerly by the *Thread and Colour of his Style*. Indeed, tho' he has the Vanity to declare this to be his Extraordinary Faculty, yet he has withal the Modesty *not to hope that* (a) *he shall convince any body* (a); and in this, I dare say, he is not mistaken. For 'tis somewhat hard to imagine, how a Man should enter into the Spirit and Delicacy and all the Various Niceties of a Dead Tongue, who is so far from having any exquisite sense of these things, even in that very Tongue, which he was born and bred up in. I shall take an occasion by and bye to give the Reader such a Specimen of his English Eloquence, as will discourage any body (if there be any body left, who is not yet discourag'd) from chusing Him for a Taster. In the mean time, to stay the Reader's Longing, I shall instance in One  
Hap-

(a) Differ.  
p. 52.

Happy Phrase, newly minted by the Dr in this very Paragraph : he speaks here of the *Mien of a Face*; which, as I take it, is much the same thing with the *Behaviour of a Look*, or the *Carriage of a Smile* : I do not know how particular the Dr's *Mien* or his *Face*, may be ; for, to my knowledge, I never saw him ; but the *Mien of the Face* of his *Scyle* the Reader must allow me, even from this single instance, is somewhat extraordinary !

THE Use of the *Attic Dialect* was made one shrewd Objection against *Phalaris*; the Use of the *Attic Talent*, Dr Bentley is resolv'd, shall be another. This Way of Counting recurs pretty often in the Epistles ; however not so often, as that an Argument built upon it should deserve to be rank'd among the *General Proofs* : but I am so little sensible of the force of it, that I am willing to allow it a place there ; and if Dr Bentley can make it out, I promise to renounce, not those Particular Epistles only from whence 'tis taken, but the Whole Sett of them.

The Dr, upon this Article, accuses his *Mock Phalaris* of mistaking the *Sicilian Talent* : and this Mistake of his, he, with his usual Gaity, calls a *Slippery Way of telling Money* (a); and therefore cautions us against (a) *Differ. dealing with him* (b). He explains himself p. 53. thus, -- That the *Sicilian Talent* was the Low- (b) *Ibid.* est of any; that *Phalaris* promising in his Epistles to several of his Countrymen Talents in General, must be understood to mean *Sicilian* Ta-

Talents, whereas he means nothing like it; Now (says the Dr) if a Bargain were made in England, to pay so many Pounds, or Marks; and the Party should pretend at last, that he meant Scots Marks, or French Livres; few, I suppose, would care to have Dealings with him. And this Diff. p. 54 is the very Case in so many of these Letters\*. So far from being the Case, that the Case is just contrary! For if the Sicilian Talents were so very Low, and Phalaris must be thought to intend them in his Promises, and yet paid Atticones; those he dealt with had certainly no reason to complain of him. Would a man think himself ill us'd in Scotland, who should have a General Promise made him of so many Pounds, which he expected to be made good in the Pounds of the Country; and receiv'd 'em afterwards in good English Sterling? What could possibly give this Perverse Turn even to Dr Bentley's Imagination? What Cloudy Author had he been conversing with, that could put him into this State of Perplexity and Confusion? We have great hopes indeed that the Intricate Accounts of this Paragraph should be clear'd up, by such an Head in such Order! But, it may be, the Dr did not intend this for a Remark that was to Edifie his Reader; but for a pure piece of harmless Diversion. Having therefore sported himself a little, he resumes the Chair, and thus authoritatively dictates to us.

We are to know, that in Sicily, as in most other Countries, the Name and Value of their Coins, and the way of reckoning by Summs, was peculiar. The Sum Talent, in the Sicilian Account, contain'd no more in Specie than Three Attic Drachms,



or Roman Denares ; as plainly appears from Aristotle \*, in his now lost Treatise of the Sicilian \* Pollux: Government. And the Words of Festus are <sup>l. ix, c. 6.</sup> most express ; *Talentorum non unum Genus : Atticum est sex millium Denarium, Syracusanum trium denarium. What an Immense Difference ! One Attic Talent had the real value of Two thousand Sicilian Talents. Now in all these Epistles the very Circumstances assure us, that by the word Talent simply nam'd, the Attic Talent is understood. But should not our wise Sophist have known, that a Talent, in that Country where he had laid the Scene of his Letters, was quite another thing ? Without Question, if the true Phalaris had penn'd them, he would have reckon'd these sums by the Sicilian Talents, encreasing only the Number : Or should he have made use of the Attic Account, he should always have given express notice of it ; never saying *τάλαντον* alone, without the addition of *Ἀττικόν* (a).*

(a) Diff.

p. 54, 55.

Now, in opposition to the Dr's Reasonings and Authorities about this matter of the Talents, I shall endeavour to shew, that what the Dr says *we are to know*, we are still *to know*, after all the Information he has vouchsaf'd to give us ; and that if we did *know* it, we could not from thence gather, that these Epistles are Spurious. For if there is room to suspect that the Dr's Witnesses are corrupted, if their Testimony is inconsistent, if they tell us things demonstratively false, if the Dr says more than his Witnesses do, if there be stronger Authority to counterbalance theirs ; if, admitting what they say, or what the Dr makes 'em say, to be true, the Letters may be nevertheless Authentic : if these things can be made

made good, the Dr will, I hope, pardon me, if I refuse to part with *Phalaris*, upon any Quarrel about the *Talents*.

The Dr's Witnesses are *Pollux*, and *Esfus*, whom I shall examine severally. *Aristotle* indeed is call'd in for a Witness; but He not appearing in Person, we have his Testimony only at second-hand: so that its force will wholly depend on the Authority of *Pollux*, the Relater. To Him we are refer'd in the Margin; but it doth not appear from the Book and Chapter there cited, that the Treatise of *Aristotle* which, the Dr says, is now Lost, was ever found. That *Aristotle* wrote Πολιτείας, or accounts of the State and Policy of several Particular Cities, and of several

*Sicilian Cities*, among the rest, is sufficiently known \*: but that he wrote any thing which bore such a Title as a Treatise of the Sicilian Government, we want the Light

\* Πολιτεῖαι πόλεων συστῆναι  
 διὰ (ἀνέκδοτον) καὶ ἑκατόν,  
 καὶ ἰδίᾳ δημοκρατικῶν, ὀλιγαρχικῶν, ἀριστοκρατικῶν, καὶ  
 τυραννικῶν Diog. in Vit. Arist.

of some other Lost Treatise to make plain to us. A Treatise of *Aristotle*, but not under this Name, is cited by *Pollux* in this Chapter: but whether that part of this Chapter which concerns the value of *Talents* be genuine, we have Room to doubt. *Seberus*, in his Notes on *Pollux*, tells us, that from Pag. 435, v. 32, of his Edition, to the End of the 6th Chapter, (within which space all that is said of *Talents* lies) is wanting in One MS. But allowing it to be genuine, what the Dr says is plain from that place in *Pollux*, is so far from being plain from thence, that *Pollux* must be chang'd and help'd out from other Authors, before he

can

can be made to speak to the purpose. It plainly appears to the Dr from *Aristotle*, as there cited by *Pollux*, that the *Sicilian Talent* in the *Sicilian Account* contain'd no more in *Species* than three *Attic Drachms*, or *Roman Denares*. But tho' the *Sicilian Talent* be there mention'd, 'tis neither adjust'd to *Attic Drachms*; nor *Roman Denares* (a). Two sorts of *Sicilian Talents* are there taken notice of; an *Ancient*, and a *Later*: That equal to 24 *Nummi*, This to 12. And the *Nummus* is said to be equal to three *δρόλια*. So that before the Value of the *Sicilian*

(a) Τὸ μὲν τοι Σικελικὸν  
τῶ λαντον ἐλάγχιον ἔχει τὰ  
μὲν ἀρχαῖον, ὡς Ἀριστοτέλης  
λέγει, τεσσαρας καὶ ἑκασι τὸς  
νύμμις· τὸ δὲ ὑστέρων δυο-  
καίδεκα· διασφαί δὲ τὸ  
νύμμιον τρία \* δρόλια·  
Poll. l. 9. c. 6.

*Talent* can be settled from this Passage, the Value of the *Nummus* should be first agreed on, which it will not be very easie to fix from its given proportion to the *δρόλια*, because that is a *Species of Money* we are *Strangers* to; and the *Criticks* are agreed we owe that *Coin* purely to a *Corrupt Reading* of the Text: (which, by the bye, is much such an Instance of *Equivocal Generation*, as that which the Dr tells us of \*, where he makes *Mu- \* Diff.*  
*shrooms* to grow out of a *Rotten Passage* in *Suidas*). P. 113.

Some therefore for *δρόλια* read *δρόβλια*, others *ἡμισόβλια*. This Latter must be own'd to be a greater departure from the Letter of the Text than the Former; so that if we admit it, in order to our settling the value of the *Nummus*, and consequently of the *Talent*, we do not owe our Light in this matter to what we read in *Pollux*; but to what we gather from

our

our own Conjectures, or from other Authors. When we have put ἡμισόβλια for ὁμόβλια, 'tis granted, that the *Nummus*, which is equal to three half-*Obolus*'s, or one *Obolus* and an half, is the same with the *Nummus Sestertius* of the *Romans*: the value of which being known from other Authors, and its proportion to the *Roman Denare*; the proportion of the *Sicilian Talent* to the *Roman Denare* is thereby made out. But those who go this way to work in settling the value of the *Sicilian Talent* from this obscure and corrupted passage, seem to take it for granted, that the Greek word νῦμμο in *Pollux* means the *Roman Nummus*, or *Sestertius*; and then adjust the obscure word ὁμόβλια (by changing it into ἡμισόβλια) to the known value of the *Sestertius*.

\* Ὁ δὲ νῦμμο δουκὶ μὲν ἐν Ῥωμαίων τοιαύτῃ νομισματικῇ ἐστὶ δὲ Ἑλληνικὸν καὶ ἐν Ἰταλίᾳ καὶ Σικελίᾳ Δωριέων. L. 9. C. 6.

But *Pollux* tells us, that tho' \* νῦμμο may seem to be a *Roman Name* of Money, yet it is a *Greek one*, and a *Term* of the *Dorians* in *Italy* and *Sicily*.

And if so, 'tis more probable that the *Sicilian Talent* is here compar'd to the *Dorian* or *Sicilian Nummi*, whatever those were, than to the *Roman Sestertii*. Had *Pollux* given us the Value of the *Sicilian Talent* in his own Name and Words, we might have suppos'd that he adjust'd it to the *Roman Monies*; but 'tis absurd to think that *Aristo-*

† Τὸ μὲν ἀρχαῖον, ὡς Λεισυτάλης λέγει, καὶ νῦμμος, &c. ut supra.

tle, whose words † are here cited for the value of the *Talent*, should give it us in *Roman Sestertii*, which were a *Coin* not stamp'd at *Rome*, till after *Aristotle's*

Storle's time (a). So that the Ground upon which the receiv'd Computation of the *Sicilian Talent* seems to have been made, plainly fails. But admitting the *Nummus* here to be the same with the *Roman Sestertius*, which we have good reason not to admit; and that  $\eta\mu\mu\sigma\beta\lambda\iota\alpha$  is rightly substantiated, which we have no reason to grant: yet after all, Dr Bentley has impos'd upon us in his valuation of the *Sicilian Talent*.

For the Value of the more Ancient *Sicilian Talent*, which is equal to 24 *Nummi* or *Sestertii*, will be equivalent not to Three, but to Six *Roman Denares*, or *Attic Drachms*; it being agreed on all hands, that each *Sestertius* is one fourth part of a *Denare* or *Drachm*: so that the Dr has sunk the value of the *Sicilian Talent* (admitting this Computation) half in half. The Later *Sicilian Talent* will indeed at this rate be, as the Dr puts it; but the more Ancient one will be double its Value. But tho' the Dr in his way of telling Money after *Tollux*, slips the Old Talent, (which it had been fair to have taken notice of, since *Phalaris* must be suppos'd to reckon by those Talents that were most ancient) and gives us the value only of the Later one; yet the difference between these Two Talents is not, I own, so great, as to be worth contending for: since 'tis freely acknowledg'd, that the Talents mention'd in *Phalaris* must be put at a higher rate than even the greater *Sicilian Talent*, if that

(a) Who dy'd Olymp. cxi. according to *Sextius*. And *Pliny* tells us, *Argentum signatum est Anno urbis 485*, (others read 484) *Quinto Fabio Consule*, 5 annis ante primum *Punicum bellum*. *Nat. Hist. l. 33*. And it is generally understood by the Writers *de Re Nummaria* that *Sestertii* were then first coin'd.

Now *A. U. C.* 585, falls in with *Ol.* 153. *A. U. C.* 485, with *Ol.* 128.

that was worth no more than Six Roman Denares, or Attic Drachms. The value of a Denare, or Drachm, is computed by all Authors, and may be prov'd by the Scales to be equal to 7 d. ob. so that six of these will amount to 3 s. 9 d. the Price, as is pretended, of the Greater Sicilian Talent: and Three of them, to half that Sum, 1 s. 10 d. ob. the value of Dr Bentley's Talent. But now if Pollux had expressly told me from Aristotle, that these were the several Values of the Two Sicilian Talents, I should have made some difficulty of giving him any Credit in this matter. For I find, that the same Pollux, as we now have him, cites Aristotle for things of this nature, which even upon Aristotle's Authority I cannot admit. He tells us from

(a) Ἐν Ἱμεραίων πολιτείᾳ φησὶν (Ἀριστοτέλης) ὥς οἱ μὲν Σικελιωῖται τὸς δύο χαλκοὺς ἕξ ἀλίστρα καλοῦσι, τὸς δὲ ἕξ, ἡμίλιτρον. L. 4. C. 24.

(b) Παρ' αὐτῷ (Ἀριστοτέλης) πρὸς ἂν ἐν τῇ Ἱμεραίων πολιτείᾳ καὶ ἄλλα ἔντροι Σικελῶν ὀνόματα, ὅτ' ἐν ἡμίαντι ὁ πρὸς δίδωται χαλκοῦν ἕνα καὶ ἕξ τάλαντα, ὁ πρὸς ἐστὶ δύο χαλκοὺς, καὶ τρία τάλαντα, ὁ πρὸς τρεῖς. L. 9. C. 6.

Aristotle (a), that the Sicilians reckon'd that Two Brass Pieces (χαλκοί) were equal to Six Litra; and that Six Brass Pieces were equal to half a Litra. Now that Two should be twelve times as much as Six, is not according to the receiv'd Rules of Arithmetic: To puzzle us still more, Pollux tells us in another place (b), from the same Treatise of Aristotle, that Six Talents are equal to Two Brass Pieces; and that Three Talents are equal to Three of the same Brass pieces; that is, that

Three are more than Six. I beg to be excus'd, if I cannot believe Pollux, that Aristotle counted at this rate; because I always thought, that

that Aristotle had some little Skill in Mathematics. It would not perhaps be difficult to offer some Emendations, that might set these things right (a): but till that is done, Pollux's Calculations are of no great Credit with me. Pollux, in the same place which the Dr cites for his value of the Talents, informs us (b), that as

(a) Not to be too reserved with the Dr, I shall now offer what may set Pollux right: and I wish the Dr himself were as capable of Emendation. My Conjecture, for I do not pretend to Demonstrate in these matters, is this, — That ἐξ τάλαντα, or rather ἐξ ἀτάλαντον, &c. is an Error of the Copyists for ἐξ ἀλτρον, &c. and, that the Compounds of λίτρα with the derivatives of τρεῖς, and τέσσαρες, and ἑξ, were such Doric words as signified τὸ ἐκ τῶν, τρίτον, and τρίτον της λίτρας; like the Sextans, Quadrans, and Triens of the Romans; and were nothing but Two, Three, and Four Ουγκίαι. That the Sicilian Talent was a piece of Silver, that answer'd in former days to a Talent-weight, or 60 Litra weight of Brass; and that this Quantity of Brass was then divided into 24 pieces, call'd νύμμι, each νύμμι being equal to two pounds and an half of Brass, which the Romans would have call'd Nummus Sestertius; as they would Four of them, a Decussis. That afterwards, Silver falling in Price, compar'd with Brass, is sunk at last so low (and we know from the Romans how much more it sunk a long time after) as that the Silver piece call'd formerly a Talent, was now worth only Half what it was, and grown equivalent but to Twelve Nummi Sestertii, or three Decusses; and that, according to that Value therefore Festus (if the present Reading of him prevails) express'd it by Three Roman Denarii. That, by this time, little Silver Litrae being coin'd, equal, by the later Value, to a Litra of Brass, and in Quantity to an Ægean Obolus, the Nummus Sestertius was consequently equivalent to Two and an Half of those Litrae or Oboli; that is, to a τρίτην ἡμιόβελον, to be understood, as Pollux himself will direct in that Chapter: And that so, I suppose, it might have been express'd by Aristotle, and should be read in Pollux.

(b) He tells us expressly, that the Mina of each Country is divided into 100 Drachms of that Country. Ἡ μνᾶ δὲ ὡς παρ' Ἀθηνῶν ἐκαστὸν εἶχεν δραχμὰς ἑκατὸν. ὅτι καὶ παρὰ τοῖς ἄλλοις τῆς ὀπαχωρίας δισμύνας πρὸς λόγον τὴν καθ' ἑκάστην τάλαντα καὶ τετραδύντα, καὶ ἀραιέριον L. 9. C. 6. And if the Drachmae of each Country rise and fall in proportion to the Talent, it is evident, that there are as many Hundreds of them, that is, as many Minas, in one Talent as in another. And so Brerewood understands Pollux: Omne Talentum, ut Suidas & Pollux inquit, continet Minas 60, ut Mina Drachmas 100. Proinde 6000 Drachmas continebat Talentum Omne propriis scil. ejus regionis, cujus Talentum esse dicebatur. De Nummis, p. 26.

Talentum quodvis sex millia Drachmarum sui generis habet, quæ ad Atticæ reductæ variant. Gron. de Pec. Vet. c. 3.

the *Attic Talent* was divided into Sixty *Attic Mina*, and each of those *Mina* into an Hundred *Attic Drachms*, so the *Talent* of each Country was divided into the same number of *Mina*; and each *Mina* into the same number of *Drachms* proportionably to the value of the several *Talents*. So that the *Sicilian Mina*, the 60th part of the greater *Sicilian Talent*, will at this rate be just Three Farthings of our Money; and the *Sicilian Drachm*, the hundredth part of that minute Summ, *i. e.* more than three and thirty times less than our Farthing. Now it cannot easily be imagin'd, that the *Sicilian Drachm*, which was a Coin current amongst them, should be so unconceivably little as it must be, if its value were but the three and thirtieth part of our Farthing: and yet we must not stop here, but must carry our Imagination further, and still break that Particle of Metal into Two Parts, if we would reach the Littleness of that other *Drachm* which answers to the Lesser, or Dr Bentley's *Talent*; being not quite the 66th part of our Farthing, and that in Silver too: a Species of Money, not to be counted without the help of Microscopes. So that when we have occasion hereafter to express the Value, or rather worthlessness, of any contemptible Performance, we shall in compliment to the Dr's Criticism say, it is not worth a *Sicilian Drachm*.

I beg the Reader's Patience, while I take a Review of what has been said in answer to the Dr's First Authority. The Value of the *Sicilian Talent* appears clearly to him from a *Lost Treatise*, which he owns has long since disappear'd, and which I think never did appear. That part of *Polinx*, where he finds the Remains of this *Lost Treatise*, is of suspected Cre-



Credit. If it is Genuine, it is Imperfect, and to be supply'd by Guess. The Supplies which have been made to it seem to have been built upon a Wrong Supposition, that the *ῥάμμα* in *Pollux* was a Roman Word. When these Supplements are admitted, they do not sink the Talent in dispute quite so low as the Dr doth. *Pollux*, whose Authority we must depend upon for this Citation from *Aristotle*, cites things of this nature from him, which, as they there stand, are demonstrably false. In his Division of the Talent, he breaks it into pieces, which, admitting the Dr's Rate of the Talent, are of no Value and of no Use.

If this Plea (for the Length of which I beg the Reader's Pardon) is sufficient to invalidate the Authority of *Pollux*, the Testimony of *Festus* will admit of an easier Dispatch. For not to insist on any of those Exceptions against *Pollux*, which affect *Festus* equally with Him, it is observable that the Book which we now have under the Name of *Festus*, is not the Work of *Festus*, but compos'd out of some Fragments of *Festus*, and an *Epitome* of *Festus*, which *Paulus Diaconus*, a mean Writer \*, whose Picture *Scaliger* has so drawn, as if an Acquaintance of mine had fate for it, made in *Charles the Great's* time. The Original *Festus*, if we had him entire, was but an *Epitome* of *Verrinus Flaccus*; and *Scaliger* thinks it a Just Judgment upon *Festus*, for having abridg'd *Flaccus*, that his *Epitome* was *Epitomiz'd* by so Ignorant a Creature as *Paulus*. But, what is most to our Purpose, those that give us these words

\* *Paulus Longobardus confiditissimus ac nihil Festo perjurare, quam quod in li manus incidit in Ep. Ded. ad C. in Festum.*

\* *Paulus Longobardus, homo  
confidentissimus ac ineptissimus  
nihil Festo pejus potuit acci-  
dere, quam quod in hujus Pau-  
li manus inciderit. Jof. Scal.  
in Ep. Ded. ad Castigationes  
in Festum.*

of *Festus*, (if they be His) which the Dr says are *express* to his point, take care to warn us, that for *Syracusanum trium Denarium*, we ought to read, *Syracusanum trium millium Denarium*. Which Error may be suppos'd easily to have crept into the Copies of *Festus*, by leaving out the Capital Letter M, between the Words *Trium* and *Denarium*.

I have consulted all the Editions of *Festus* I could meet with, and find none \* which doth not take notice of this Emendation; and This the Dr could not be a Stranger to: and had He therefore been a Fair Dealer in this matter, *Festus* had not been quoted at such a Loose Rate, to prove *Phalaris* a foul one.

\* See *Gorhofredi Notæ ad Schedas Festi fragmento de trahis.*

p. 224.

See the same *Gorhofredus's* Notes upon *Festus*, p. 1821.

See *St Andreæ's* Edition of *Festus*, where, in the Text, 'tis *trium Denarium*, but in the Margin, *trium Millium*.

See *Antonius Augustinus's* Notes upon *Festus*, at the word *Talent*; where he says, *Mendosus hic Locus est, & qui non patitur Emendationem. Hoc unum certum est, Talentorum non unum esse Genus, & Atticum esse Sex Millium Denarium: Cetera incerta sunt.*

See *Dr Bernard, de Ponderibus & Mensuris*, who supposes the *Talent of Syracuse* to be of 3000 Denares, and quotes *Festus* for it.

See *Dacier's* Notes upon *Festus*.

The Opinion which the Dr would have us entertain of his Great Reading would have been better confirm'd, had he supported his Notion of the Low Value of the *Sicilian Talent* by good Authorities taken from approv'd *Sicilian* Writers, or others that purposely treat of *Sicilian* Affairs. But, whether the Dr knows it or not, he had good reason to decline the testimony of those, who so plainly declare against him. For they give us better Grounds for setting an higher Price on the *Talent*, by which

*Si-*

*Sicilian* Authors us'd to reckon, than *Gollux* and *Festus* could give us for placing it so low; tho' they had been more express to the Dr's purpose than they are.

*Diodorus* a *Sicilian*, writing of *Sicilian* Affairs, frequently uses the word *Talent*, without any Addition; which therefore, according to the Dr, must mean the *Sicilian*: and which yet, by the Circumstances, must have as great a Price put upon it, as the *Talents* mention'd by *Phalaris* require. He tells us, that *Agathocles* being possess'd of a Garrison of the *Messinians* in *Sicily*, offer'd to surrender it to 'em for thirty *Talents* (a). Here a *Sicilian* Writer speaking of a Contract between the Prince of one *Sicilian* Town, and People of another, mentions *Talents*, which must be the *Sicilian*, according to Dr *Bentley's* Reasoning; but must not be *Sicilian*, according to his Computation. For by his Reckoning, a Garrison, upon a fair bargain, was to be parted with for less than Three pounds: which, if it be true, 'tis probable *Agathocles* got less by selling his Garrisons, than his Pots.

Agon *Diodorus* tells us, that *Gorgias* the famous Rhetorician of *Leontium* (b), had One hundred *Mina* a-piece from his Scholars, (*Sicilian Mina* they must be, according to the Dr) for teaching 'em his Art. This, tho' taken notice of by the Historian as an Extraordinary Price, was very inconsiderable Pay (c) for so great a

(a) Ἀγαθοκλῆς ὁ τῷ Συρακοσίων Δυνάτῃ κατέχοντι πόλιν ἢ Μεσσηνίων ἐπὶ ἡγεμονίᾳ λαοῦ λαόν περ αὐτῶν τριάκοντα τέλαντα πωρεῖσθαι τὸ πέν.

Diod. Sic. l. 19.

ὃ πῶς ἐπιτορικός φησὶ ἐξεδρεῖ, καὶ κατὰ τὴν συνθήκην τοσούτων τῆς ἀλλης ὑπέβαλεν ὅτε μισθὸν λαμβάνειν ὅσα τῷ μαθητῶν μίνας ἑκατόν.

L. 12. (c) It amounts to 3 s. 1 d. ob. of our Money

Master; unless we may suppose, that he taught at different Prices, in proportion to the Improvements of his Scholars; and then I can allow the Dr that there is, a sort of Eloquence, which had been too dear a Purchase even at that rate.

From the same Author we learn (a) that the *Syracusians*, after a signal Victory, gave One *Mina* to each of their Subjects, that had behav'd themselves well in the Fight. The Relater of this is a *Sicilian*; those who

(a) Μετὰ ὅ ἡ μάχῃ οἱ  
Συρακόσιοι τὴν μὴν ἐπιλέκ-  
τους ὄντας ἱξαιοσύναι, αὐτοῖς  
ῥοομέναις τὴν νίκης ἐστέρῃ  
ἀριστὰ δόντες ἀργυρίῳ μίαν  
ἑκάστῳ. L. 11.

give, and those who receive the Reward are *Sicilians* of *Syracuse*, the very place from whence the Dr's Low Talent had its Denomination: The Persons honour'd with this Gratuity are such as had distinguish'd themselves by their Bravery; and for their Exemplary Courage, and eminent Service to their Country they are crown'd, and each of them receives, according to the Dr's Estimation, the moiety of *Three Farthings*. A noble Donative! for which no doubt the States were often remember'd by the Soldiery in the best Wine of *Syracuse*!

*Theocritus*, another *Sicilian* Writer, in one of his *Idylliums*, mentions both *Mina* and *Drachma*. The Persons he introduces speaking (b) are two *Syracusan* Ladies; they talk  
*Doric*,

(b)

Γοργώ·

Πεσξινόα, μάλα τοὶ τὸ καταπύχες ἐμπρόναμα  
Τέτο ὥρεται· λέγει μοι, πόσω κατέδα πι ἀρ' ἰσῶ;

Πεσξινόη·

Μὴ μνάσῃς, Γοργῶ· πλέον ἀργυρίῳ καθάρῳ \* μίαν  
ἢ δύο. Idyll. 12.

\* *Stephens* in the margin reads *μνάς*.

*Doric*, the Language of *Syracuse*. The One admires the Others fine Habit, which she had put on upon a Great Festival, to appear at Court in, and asks the Price of it : The Other answers her, that it cost somewhat more than a *Mina* or two ; and seems to make an Excuse for her Extravagance : which, if she paid for it in the Dr's Mony, she need not have done, considering they were her Holiday-clothes.

In the same *Idyllium* we have an account of *Five Fleeces* (\*) bought for *Seven Drachms*. It is true, we are told it was bad ware : but the Woman had no great Reason to rail at her Husband as a Spendthrift, and an ill Market-man (as we find she doth) if the Whole Purchase fell short of the Eighth part of a Farthing.

It would be easie, if pardonable, to multiply Instances of this Nature from *Sicilian* Writers, or such as treat of things transacted in *Sicily*. A Neighbouring State (a) is by a Bribe of 15 Talents (b) prevail'd with to forsake the *Agrigentines*, their Allies. Sixty Talents (c) are offer'd by the *Egestani* of *Sicily* for a Months pay (d) for 60 Ships, which they had occasion to borrow. *Timoleon* (e) the Restorer of *Syracuse* to its Liberties and

(a) Diod. Sic. l. 17.

(b) Less than 30 Shillings.

(c) Thucyd. p. 353.

(d) A Talent 1 s. 10 d. ob. for a Months pay of a Ship.

(e) Plut. in Vita Timoleonis.

G 4

Rights

---

(\*) Χάμεις ταῦτά γ' ἔχει σφόδ' ἀργυρίη. Διοκλῆδας·  
 Ἐπὶ δ' ὀρεσχημῶν κυνάδας, γραιῶν ὑπὸ ἰλματα παρᾶν,  
 Πέντε πόνως ἑλαβ' ἔχθρῆς, ἀπὸν ῥύπος

Rights, was magnificently buried by the State, which he had deliver'd, at the Charge

(a) 6 s. 3 d.

(b) Less than 100 pounds.

(c) Plut. *ibid.*

(d) Plato, *Ep.* 7.

(e) Less than 10 pounds.

(f) Poly. p. 249.

(g) Less than 7 pounds.

of (a) 200 *Mina*. A vast Fund of (b) a Thousand Talents is rais'd by letting out Ground and Houses to 60000 men, for the Recruit of *Syracuse*, after it had been ruin'd by a War (c). *Dion's* Estate, (d) which lay at *Syracuse*, is reckon'd a Great one ; and its full value said to be an Hundred (e) Talents. Two Sicilian Princes (f) send 75 Talents to the *Rhodians* (g) for their Relief, after they

had been ruin'd by an Earthquake ; but could not raise so great a Sum at once, and therefore sent it by Parcels. In short, after some search into this matter, I am perswaded no one instance can be produc'd of Talents, or other Moneys mention'd by any *Sicilian* Writer, or any one that writes of *Sicily*, which will countenance or admit of the Low Valuation of the *Sicilian* Talent, that Dr *Bentley* espouses.

But because I find the Modern Dealers in ancient Monies go into the Opinion of a *Sicilian* Talent of Low Value, without any other Authority, as I can find, but the obscure and interpolated Passages of *Pollux* and *Festus*, I shall lay no stress upon the Exceptions that have been made against that Opinion : since we may freely admit such a Low Value of this Talent, and yet think these Letters Genuine. For there might be a low Value of the *Sicilian* Ta-

Talent in some other Age, and yet the Talent of *Phalaris's* time might be higher. Or there might be a Talent of this Low Value in other parts of *Sicily*, and yet the Talent of *Agrigentum*, a distinct State, might be higher. Or there might be a Low Talent (a) of baser Metal, suppose Brass, equal to a *Litra*; and yet the Silver Talents, which *Phalaris's* are expressly said to be (b), might be higher. Or there might be a Low Value us'd

(a) The Talents in Pollux, being compar'd to χαλκοί, and being according to the present reading of Pollux, lower in Value than they, seem to be Brass rather than Silver.

(b) Epp. 118. 95.

by the natives, and ancient Inhabitants of *Sicily*, and the Talent us'd by the *Greek Colonies* that plac'd themselves there, might be higher. Or if in *Phalaris's* time there was a Silver Talent of this Low Value, of use among the *Greek Colonies*, at *Agrigent*, and elsewhere, as possibly there might have been a piece of Silver so call'd, because Equivalent to a Talent weight of Brass; and such *Litra's* there were we know: yet could it not be properly term'd a Talent of Silver Money, when a Talent was simply mention'd, and without specification. For then it must mean the Common Talent, not that consisting of little Obolary *Litra*, representing Brass Pounds, but That every where us'd, made of *Litra*, or *Mina* of the same Metal, and those divided, each into an 100 *Drachma*, and these into *Oboli*: However, if this is not to be admitted, yet still the Reasons that may be offer'd for *Phalaris's* using the *Attic Dialect* (to speak loosely) tho' a *Sicilian*, will justify his reckoning the Talents, as the *Athenians* did. Or if these Letters might by a Later hand be chang'd out of the

*Doric*

*Doric* Dialect into the *Attic*, the same hand might make 'em speak *Attic*, in the valuation of the Monies. All these Suppositions must be shewn impossible, before any convincing Argument can be drawn from hence, to prove these Letters Spurious. Or Lastly, tho' none of these Reasonings should hold, 'tis agreed

(a) *Talentum* sine adjecti-  
one *Scriptoribus antiquis*  
passim pro *Attico*. *Gronov.*  
de P. c. Vet. c. 3.

*Talentum Atticum* pro-  
priè *τάλαντον* in scriptis  
Græcis Latinisque. *Bernard.*  
in Ep. ad Pocock.

Semper in Auctoribus  
(præter Sacros) ubi Nomen  
*Talenti* occurrit, hoc ipsum  
(*Atticum*, 6000 *Drachma-*  
*rum Atticarum*) intelligen-  
dum est, si Nomen *Talenti*  
absolute positum sit, neq;  
distinctionis causâ aliquid  
adjiaciatur.

*Brerewood* de Num. p. 27.

by those, who treat of these matters (a), and give us this low Value of the *Sicilian Talent*, that wherever the Word *Talent* is us'd by Greek Writers, without any addition, the *Attic Talent* must be understood. So far are the Learned from thinking, as the Dr doth, that *Phalaris*, had he made use of the *Attic Account*, should always have given express notice of it: and never have said *τάλαντον* alone, without the addition of *Ἀττικόν*. For They, who were conversant in o-  
ther Books beside Dictiona-

ries were sensible, that *Sicilian* Writers frequently us'd the Word *Talent* in the *Attic* sense of it, without any such express Limitation. And if Other *Sicilian* Authors might express themselves in this manner, without being suspected as Spurious, *Phalaris* is unjustly suspected by the Dr on this account. As to this head, he stands or falls, with the rest of his Countrymen: and I doubt not but the Reader, upon a fair and impartial View of what has been said to This Article of Dr Bentley's Indictment against *Phalaris*, will pronounce him *Not Guilty*.

H I.



Hitherto Dr Bentley has kept himself pretty well within his Province, and criticis'd chiefly upon Words, and Phrases, and Dialects; in his next General Proof he ventures to criticise upon Things, and to shew the Letters an Imposture, from the Matter and Business of 'em \*. They are a Fardle of \* Dissert. Common Place, ( he says ) without any Life or p. 55. Spirit from Action and Circumstance: When You come to 'em, YOU FIND BY THE EMPTINESS AND DEADNESS OF THEM, THAT YOU CONVERSE WITH A DREAMING PEDANT, WITH HIS ELBOW ON HIS DESK; not with an active ambitious Tyrant, with his Hand on his Sword, &c. All that takes or affects You is a Stiffness, and Stateliness, and Operoseness of Style, &c. which is quite aliene from the Character of Phalaris, a Man of Business and Dispatch †.

Stiffness, and Stateliness, and Operoseness of Style, is indeed quite aliene from the Character of a Man of Business and Dispatch: for which reason, any body that reads Dr Bentley would easily guess, that he is not a Man of business. And not being a Man of Business, but a Library-keeper, it is not over modestly done of him, to oppose his Judgment and Taste in this case to that of Sir William Temple; who is certainly a Man of Business, and knows more of these things, than Dr Bentley does of Hesychius and Suidas. For, as his Friend Mr Wotton has with Great Sagacity observ'd, It is Universally acknowledg'd, that he who has studied any Subject is a better Judge of that Subject,

\* Dissert.

p. 62, 63.

\* Reflect.  
upon an-  
cient and  
modern  
Learning,  
p. 20.

ject, than another Man who did never purposely bend his Thoughts that way; provided they be both Men of Equal Parts\*. Sir William Temple has spent a good part of his Life in transacting Affairs of State; He has written to Kings, and They to him; and this has qualified him to judge how Kings should write, much better than all Dr Bentley's Correspondence with Foreign Professors; especially if they be such Professors, as have the Judgment to admire Him, and His Humanity. I shall not therefore offer a Word on the General Part of this Head, in Justification of the Epistles: I shall barely set down the Passage in which Sir William Temple expresses his Sense of this matter; and shall then leave it to the Reader, whose Opinion he'll think fit to take, either His, or the Library keeper's at St James's. Sir William's admirable Words are, *I think he must have but little skill in Painting, that cannot find out this to be an Original. Such Diversity of Passions upon such Variety of Actions, and Passages of Life and Government; such freedom of Thought, such Boldness of Expression; such Bounty to his Friends, such Scorn of his Enemies; such Honour of Learned Men, such Esteem of Good; such Knowledge of Life, such Contempt of Death, with such Fierceness of Nature, and Cruelty of Revenge, could never be represented but by Him that possess'd 'em. And I esteem Lucian to have been no more capable of Writing than of Acting as Phalaris did. In all One writ You find the Scholar, or the Sophist; and in all the other writ, the Tyrant, and the Commander. It is plain, Sir William Temple does not write like a Dreaming Pedant, with his Elbow on his Desk; and there-*

therefore the Reader perhaps will be apt to take his Judgment, when he tells him, that *Phalaris* does not write like one neither.

I cannot but observe that Dr *Bentley* is here

and elsewhere (a) very Liberal in distributing the Reproach of *Pedantry*; which is to Me, I confess, a plain Proof that he has no just Notions of it: for if he had, it is so high an Offence against Good Manners, and Good Sense, that methinks

(a) *Those Little Pedants, that have stalkt about in the Apparel of Heroes.* Diff. p. 29.

— that wretched *Pedantry* in the matter, p. 65.

— affected to excel each other, even to *Pedantry*, P. 41, &c.

he should impute it more sparingly. I will endeavour therefore to set him right; which perhaps I shall be the better able to do, because having convers'd much a late with some Writings, where this Beauty of Style prevails, I have very strong and sensible Impressions of it.

PEDANTRY is a Word of a very various and mix'd meaning, and therefore hard to be Defin'd: but I will Describe it to the Dr as well as I can, by pointing out some of the Chief Marks and Moles of it.

The first and surest Mark of a *Pedant* is, to write without observing the receiv'd Rules of Civility, and Common Decency: and without distinguishing the Characters of Those he writes to, or against: For *Pedantry* in the Pen, is what Clownishness is in Conversation; it is *Written Ill-breeding*.

It is *Pedantry*, to affect the use of an Hard Word, where there is an Easie one; or of a Greek or Latin Word, where there is an English one, that signifies the very same thing. And these Two Meanings of the Word

my

my Lord Roscommon seems to have hinted in those fine Verses of his; which are worth at least half a dozen Pages of Dr Bentley's Scraps of Callimachus, Notes and all.

*The Soil intended for Pierian Seeds  
Must be well purg'd from rank Pedantic Weeds.  
Apollo starts, and all Parnassus shakes  
At the rude Rumbling Baralipton makes.  
For none were e'er with Admiration read,  
But Who, beside their Learning, were well bred.*  
Essay on Transl. Versf.

How Dr Bentley will, on these Articles, excuse his Familiar Treatment of Sir William Temple (a), and his Course Compliments to Me (b); how he will bring off his Greek and Latin Proverbs (c), his *aliene*, and *negoce*, and concede, and repudiating a Vernacular Idiom, with an Hundred other such Elegances of Speech, I leave him to consider at his Leisure.

(a) Could neither discover the true Time nor true Value of his Authors. p. 6.

—Criticism of a Peculiar Complexion, and must proceed from a Singularity of Palate and Judgment, P. 7.

(b) Sorry Critic, Bungling Tinker, Lucian's Ass, &c.

(c) πολλά ἄγνα τὰ πολέμῳ, Asinus ad Lynam, &c.

To over-rate the Price of Knowledge, and to make as great ado about the true Rendring of a Phrase, or Accenting of a Word, as if an Article of Faith, or the Fortune of a Kingdom depended upon it, is *Pedantry*. And so is an Assuming and Positive way of delivering ones self, upon Points especially not worth our Concern, and not capable of being perfectly clear'd. And whether Dr Bentley be guilty in this respect or no, the Reader will be

be able to judge, when he has cast his Eye on the Margin, and consider'd, how many times the Dr in his Dissertation, has freely us'd the Word *Demonstrate* of his own Performances (a): and withal, how fond he is of *Negatives*, (a very dangerous way of Speech!) and that in Cases oftentimes where the Contrary Affirmative is most certainly true; as it is, and shall be prov'd to be, in all those Instances, which this Mark † refers to.

(a) — even  
Demon-  
strated,  
that the  
Epistles of  
Phal. are  
Spurious.  
P. 5.

- that Demonstrate Anaxilaus to have liv'd — P. 26.
- Demonstrate the Doric Dialect to have been, &c. P. 42.
- But which is plain Demonstration, P. 48.
- I'll Demonstrate 'em by and by to be an Imposiure. P. 116.
- I shall Demonstrate ours to be of a modern date. P. 138.
- is a Demonstrative Proof P. 141.
- † There was no such thing as Tragedy while he tyranniz'd at Agrigentum. P. 40.
- ~~οὐδ' αὖτε~~ never us'd by the Ancients in that sense. P. 52.
- By that time I have done with 'em, it will be no more a Contraversion, whether they are Spurious. P. 89.
- There is No MS above CCC Years old, that has the Fables according to that Copy. P. 146.
- In all that Tract of Time, not one Single Author, that has given us the Least Hint that Æsop was Ugly. P. 149.
- Astypalæa, a City in Crete, never mention'd by any Geographer. P. 44.
- A Discovery in Geography, that could not be learnt any where else. P. 58.
- Eustathius, who appears never to have seen the true Athenæus. P. 20.

To depart from the Common Ways of Writing or Speaking, and such as have been us'd by the best Pens, on purpose to shew ones self more Exact and Knowing than the Rest of the World, is a Piece of Affectation, that favours of Pedantry. *Tauromenium* is the word that is generally us'd by both Ancient and

and Modern Writers. Dr Bentley has re-  
form'd our Spelling, and will have it *Tauromi-*  
*nium*; because *Pliny*, and *Solinus*, (and perhaps  
somebody else) have happen'd to call it so.  
And here I must beg the Reader's Excuse, if  
I go a little out of the Way, to do right to  
*Sir William Temple*, in a Case of the Like na-  
ture: Mr *Wotton* tells him, with great Plain-  
ness of Speech, that *He, of all men, ought not*  
*to have arraign'd the Modern ignorance in Gram-*  
*mar, who puts Delphos for Delphi, every where*  
*in his Essays* \*: A Capital Mistake, and wor-  
thy to be chastiz'd by the Acute Pen of  
Mr *Wotton*! But is he sure that putting *Del-*  
*phos* for *Delphi* is an Offence against Grammar?  
I thought always, that what was according to  
Propriety, and the receiv'd use of a Tongue,  
could not be against Grammar. It may in-  
deed be against some General Rule of Gram-  
mar: but so wise a Man as Mr *Wotton* is,  
should have known, that Grammar has not  
only *General Rules*, but *Particular Exceptions*  
too; and that the Common Custom and Usage  
of a Tongue is capable of creating an Exce-  
ption at any time; and is as good a Rule as  
any in the Grammar. Now *Delphos*, for the  
Latin word *Delphi*, is us'd by all the finest  
Writers of our Tongue, and best Judges of  
it: particularly, by Mr *Waller* twice, in some  
of his Last Copies (a); which, tho' they are  
worse Poetry than the rest, yet are in Cor-  
recter English: by Mr *Dryden*, four or five  
times, in his Life of *Plu-*  
*tarch* (b); by Mr *Duke* (c),  
and Mr *Creech* (d) often in  
their several Lives of *Theſeus*, and *Solon*: and  
(be-

\* Reflect.  
upon anc.  
and mod.  
Learning,  
p. 59.

(a) P. 269,  
263.

(b) P. 6, 33, 41, 46, 48.

(c) P. 4, 20, 23, 36, 42, 59.

(d) P. 280, 288, 310.

( because perhaps One Old Divine may weigh more with Mr *Wotton* than all these Modern Witnesses ) by the Reverend and Learned Dr *Jackson*, in his Volumes on the Creed (a). (a) T. 2. Mr *Wotton* might have said indeed, that *Del-* P. 364  
*phos*, in the Singular Number, is not Good Latin, or Good Greek : but when he says, 'tis bad English, he only shews, that he does not converse with so Good Authors as he ought to do. This Digression might have been spar'd, but that Mr *Wotton*, when he was purging his Book of some unbecoming Passages in the second Edition of it, thought fit still to retain this Grammatical Reflection there : perhaps in a third Edition, he'll take care that This too shall bear the rest Company.

Dr *Bentley* will forgive me this short Visit to his *Friend*, now I return to him.

Pedantry consists also in Low and Mean ways of Speech, which are a Vicious Affectation of what is Natural and Easy, as Hard Words are of Learning and Scholarship. And whether Dr *Bentley* has not offended this way, by those Familiar Expressions of *Mother Clito the Herb-woman*, and *Going to Pot*, and *setting Horses together*, and *Roasting the Old Woman*, and by his apt Simily drawn from *Bungling Tinkers mending old Kettles*; any-body, but Pedants, can tell.

An Itch of contradicting Great Men, or Establish'd Opinions upon very slight Grounds; is another Instance of Pedantry : and (not to mention any thing that relates to the Present Dispute) something of this kind there was, I'm afraid, in Dr *Bentley's* brisk Censure of

Grotius and Scaliger for not knowing the measure of an *Anapaestic* Verse

(a) *Bentl. Ep. ad Millium* in fine *Malalæ*, p. 26.

(b) *In the Article of the Thericlean Cups.*

(c) *Modeste & circumspecte de tantis Viris pronuncian- dum est, ne forte (quod plerisque accidit) damnent quæ non intelligunt. Quint.*

(d) *C'estoit une Enemie Public, qui ne pouvoit souffrir le merite, ni la reputation de personne. L. 5. Lettr. 5.*

(a), when 'tis plain (as I shall shew before I lay down my Pen (b), ) that the Dr would never have censur'd 'em. if he had known it himself (c). *Casselvetro*, an Italian Pedant was famous for such a Snarling Faculty as this; *He was* (as *Balzac* says very well of him (d) ) a *Public Enemy*, that could not endure any-body should have Merit, or Reputation, but himself.

The Subject is fruitful ; but I will confine my self to one Particular more of the *Pedant's* Character ; and that is, a Love of Quoting Books or Passages not extant, or never seen by him, in order to amaze and confound his poor Reader, and make himself Terrible in the way of Learning. *As Aristotle says in his lost Treatise of the Sicilian Government*, says the Dr \* ; tho' that Treatise be so far lost, that *Aristotle* did really never write it. And again he tells us, what *Monfieur de Meziriac* (e) P. 135. has done in his Life of *Æsop* (e), and yet owns in the very next Line, that he never met with this Book, but only guess'd what was in it. He (f) P. 26. produces (f) the *Unknown Authors* *Diodorus* (g) P. 62. and *Lucian* (g) transcrib'd, as so many Witnesses on his side : and, in another place (h), (h) P. 28. he gives a very particular account of what *A. Gellius* said in a *Lost Chapter* ; not from any other Writer that had quoted it, but meerly by dint of Conjecture.

These



These are all the *Marks and Moles of Pedantry* that I can now stay to point out to the Dr: if he be still at a loss to know what the Pedants Character is, and where to apply it; I refer him to a Passage in *Bruyere* (a), where I think this matter is very succinctly and fully handled. There are says he, in *Learning, as in War*, a sort of *Inferiour and Subaltern Officers; Men, who seem made only for Registers and Magazines to store up the Productions of better Writers. Collectors they are, Transcribers, Plagiaries; They never think themselves; they tell You only what Others have thought before them. They heap together Matter in abundance, without Choice or Distinction; and care not how Worthless it is, so there be but Enough on't. They Know nothing, but just as they learn it from their Books; and Learn nothing but what every-body else desires to be Ignorant of. They have a Vain, Dry, Insipid sort of Knowledge; that is Disagreeable, and Useless; can neither enliven Conversation, nor conduce to Business. We are sometimes surpriz'd at their Reading, but always tir'd with their Discourse, or their Writings. These are They, who among All the Little Men, and Some Great Ones, go for Scholars; but among the Wise and Sensible part of Mankind, for Pedants.*

(a) Les Charact. ou les Mœurs de ce Siècle. Chap. des Ouvrages d'l' Esprit.

This Account of *Pedantry* has drawn me a little out of my Way; I shall now return again into it, and consider the Particular Instances Dr *Bentley* has brought to justify his General Assertion, that the *Matter and Business* of the Letters betrays 'em not to be Genuine.

\* P. 56.

The first is an *Improbable and Absurd Story* \* (as he thinks) about *Stesichorus*; who dying at *Catana*, the *Himereans* desir'd to have his Ashes brought back into his Native City *Himera*; but the *Cataneans* would not part with them. This occasion'd a fierce Contest between the two Towns, which *Phalaris* appeas'd, by prevailing with the *Himereans* to let *Stesichorus's* Ashes sleep in Peace at *Catana*, and build a Temple to the Honour of him, at Home. Now what is there in this Story either *Absurd*, or *Improbable*? that the *Himereans* should be so concern'd to get the Ashes of *Stesichorus*, and the *Cataneans* to keep them? This very thing happen'd afterwards in the case of *Euripides*; whose Bones the *Athenians* sent a solemn Embassy to *Macedonia*, to retrieve, as *A. Gellius* informs us (a); and that, not in a *Lost Chapter*. And after the Denial of this Request, we learn from *Pausanias* (b), that the *Athenians* built a Noble Monument to the Memory of *Euripides*, which continu'd even to his Time. Somewhat of the same Honour was paid to *Hesiod's* Remains; which being buried, where *Hesiod* was murder'd, a great way off *Ascra*, the *Orchomenians*, *Plutarch* tells us (c) by the Advice of the Oracle, endeavour'd all they could to get 'em into their possession; but They that had 'em, would not be prevail'd upon to part with 'em. And if *Euripides* and *Hesiod* were honour'd with such Contentions as these, after their Deaths, why might not *Stesichorus*?

(a) L. 15.  
C. 20.(b) L. 1.  
P. 2.(c) CONV.  
Sap. p. 162.(d) Diff.  
P. 57.

Ay, but says the Dr, a Temple, and Deification, were a little too Extravagant an Honour to be paid to a Poet's Memory (d). I thought such things as these could not have surpriz'd a man

man of the Dr's *Polymathy*: but, I find, he knows nothing of the several *Temples* erected to *Homer* at *Smyrna*, and in other places; as *Strabo* (a), and *Ælian* (b) expressly affirm: nor so much as remembers that Known Passage in *Tully's* Oration *pro Archia Poetâ*, which is no Secret even to the First Beginners in Learning. *Homer* (says he) the *Smyrnæans* claim as a Native of theirs; and therefore they have erected a Temple to him. From whence also Dr *Bentley* may please to learn the reason why *Phalaris* would have the *Himereans* content themselves with erecting a Temple to *Stesichorus*, because That would declare to Posterity, that he was Born there (c).

*Homerum Smyrnæi suum esse confirmant: itaque etiam Delubra E-jus in Oppido collocave: unt. (c) Smyrna Homerum Vatem sibi*

*vendicabat; Sepulcrum, Templum, & Statuas ipsius ostentant. Varro.*

Nay, it happens a little unluckily, that an Ancient *Marble* is preserv'd to this Day, (which perhaps belong'd to some Temple erected to the Honour of *Homer*, in some of the places that contended for his Birth) where the *Apotheosis*, or Deification of that Poet is describ'd; and a Learned Man, *Cuperus*, has writ a Large Comment upon it: which methinks the Dr should have been acquainted with, tho' he be not a *Foreign Professor*.

E're I quit this Particular, I must observe a Little Slip of the Dr's, in telling us, that *Himera* in *Tully's* time was call'd *Therma* \*. I \* *Dissert.* believe it was not; because *Tully* himself assures us, that *Himera* and *Therma* were two Different Towns; and the Latter built at some Distance from the Ruines of the For-

(a) Himerâ deletâ, quos Cives belli Calamitas reliquos fecerat, ii sese *Thermis* collocarant, in ejusdem agrifinibus, neq; longè ab Oppido antiquo. Or. 7. in Verr.

(b) τῆς πόλεως ἐπὶ Καρ-  
θαγίων χειρωθείσης, καὶ  
τὰς καφεύσας διέμενον αὐτοὶ  
καὶ τὸ μέγεθος καθ' ἡμᾶς  
καιρῶν. L. 11. p. 38.

mer (a). And, without this Distinction between *Himera* and *Therma* 'tis impossible to understand *Diodorus*, where he says, that after *Himera* was sack'd and ras'd by the *Carthaginians*, it continu'd altogether uninhabited, even to His Days (b): which could not be True, if *Himera* and *Therma* were the same; for, that *Therma* was well inhabited in *Diodorus's* time, is past

Dispute. I will not deny, but that some careless Passages may perhaps have dropp'd from the Pens of Old Authors, where these Two are not nicely distinguish'd: but it is not in Works, where they set up for being severe upon other Mens Mistakes; and Their want of Exactness therefore may be forgiven them. But Dr. Bentley, who professes to give no Quarter, should take care not to want any.

His Last Objection happily arose from contemplating the Matter of One Single Epistle; the Dr will now compare the Epistles together, and confute One by another. There is an *Inconsistency*, he says, between the LI<sup>th</sup> and the LXIX<sup>th</sup>, because in the LI<sup>th</sup> Phalaris's Wife is Dead, and in the LXIX<sup>th</sup>, She is Alive again \*. As if it were necessary that these Epistles should have been written just in the same Order that they stand; which is different in the Printed Copies from what it is in the MSS, and different in one MS from what

\* P. 57.

what is in another. Upon such an unreasonable Supposition as this, how many *Inconsistencies* might be found in *Tully's* Epistles ? or even in those of *St Paul* ? And yet, if this Supposition do not take place, there is no manner of *Inconsistency* between those Two Epistles of *Phalaris*. The Penetrating *Dr Bentley* seems to have had some Suspicions, that this Argument was of it self a little too weak to stand its Ground ; and therefore has back'd it with a strong Reserve of Four Other Suppositions : and if All These hold good, he will still prove the Epistles Spurious. First he supposes, that *Erythia* was poison'd by *Python*, not long after *Phalaris's* Banishment ; because otherwise, he supposes, she could not want Opportunities to follow him : then he supposes, *Erythia* was poison'd in the Island *Astypalæa*, where he supposes, that her Prisoner dwelt. Here are more *Postulatus* than *Euclid* requir'd to build the Whole Body of his Elements upon ; and yet he must be very kind to *Dr Bentley*, that will grant him any One of them ; since there is nothing either in the Epistles themselves, or in any Other History I have had the Luck to meet with, that can give 'em the least Countenance. At present therefore I take the same Liberty to deny every one of these Suppositions, as He has taken to assume them : If hereafter he can prove them in another Language, 'twill then be time enough to shew, that they are *Nothing* to the Purpose.

In some Other Epistles, the Dr has discover'd a Scene of *Putid and Senseless Formality* \*. \* *Dissert.*  
A Man of Quality in *Syracuse*, whose Wife p. 53.

was lately Dead, sends his Brother to *Phalaris*, with a Request, that he would endeavour to prevail with *Stesichorus* to write an Elegy upon Her; *Phalaris* tries, and prevails: but is not so successful in a second Attempt of the same Nature, that he makes at the Instance of another *Sicilian* Gentleman. I protest, I can see no Harm in all this: there may indeed, for ought I know, be *Putid Formality* in it, because I can't well tell what those Hard Words mean; but I see nothing Unnatural there, or Misbecoming the Character of *Phalaris*. No! says the Dr, what? *can any One believe that such Stuff as this busied the Head of the Tyrant* \*? As Low thoughts as the Dr has of the *Epistles*, I find he has very high ones of *Phalaris*: he seems to have represented him to himself, as some Mighty Monarch that had Vast Dominions, and was too Great, and too Busie, to attend such Trifles: whereas He was only a Petty Prince of One Town in *Sicily*; and, as such, I hope, the Office here given him was no ways below him. Indeed the Dr has, for the Honour of *Phalaris*, represented that Town as exceeding *Populous*; for *Diodorus*, he says, counts 200000 Souls in *Agrigent*, and Others 800000 †. *Diodorus* I grant, in the place cited, says, there were such Numbers in it, when the *Carthaginians* took it, *Olymp. LXXXIII. 3*; when (as he tells us in the same place) it was in its most prosperous and flourishing Estate: but must there needs be as many Inhabitants in it, 150 Years before, in the Reign of *Phalaris*? As for his Other Witness *Laertius*, his 800000 are given up by the

\* Dissert.  
p. 59.

† Dissert.  
p. 58.

the Learned, as a Gross Mistake; which *Bochart* supposes to have risen from the change of a Numeral K into a  $\Pi$ : or, however that may be, the Account, he says, is incredible and utterly false \*

\* *Cum res planè superat fidem, adeoque sit falsissima.*  
Phaleg. p. 553.

Incredible as it is, the Dr vouchsafes to take up with it; and it grows under his Hands: for by that time we are got to the End of this Article, these 800000 are a *Million of Subjects* †: the 200000 are thrown in † *Dissert.* carelessly to make it a Round Number. Let p. 52. it be a *Million*; yet there have been Tyrants, with many *Millions* of Subjects at their Command, who have thought fit to employ and entertain themselves much after this manner. Has the Dr, who deals so much in *Fragments*, never seen those of *Augustus's* Letters to *Horace*? has he never heard, that we owe the *Fourth Book* of *Horace's Odes*, and the finest of all his *Epistles*, to that Prince's Importunity; who press'd, and oblig'd him to write, and to make mention of him in his Poems? And such Stuff, I presume, may very well be allow'd to busie *Phalaris's Head*, which found room in the Thoughts of *Augustus*.

But why so much ado? says Our Keen Observer; could not the *Syracusan* have written to *Stesichorus*, and at the price of some *Present* met with Success \*? I agree with the Dr \* *Dissert.* that a *Present* is sometimes an *Expeditious* p. 60. Method of doing Business; I have known several things in my Life-time stick for want of it. However here it was Improper: for *Stesichorus* was not only the Greatest Poet, but one of the Greatest Men in *Sicily*. His Brother

ther *Helianax* was a Law-giver [*Νομοθέτης*] *Suidas* tells us; and He himself probably in the Government of *Himera*; or at least consulted by 'em in Extraordinary Cases, as appears by his Apologue in *Aristotle's* Rhetoric: And the true way of prevailing with such a man to employ his excellent Pen was to offer him not Money, but a Subject that deserv'd it. Some of his Brother Poets indeed were to be tempted this way: but they were men of Mean Birth, and Education; and were to make their Fortunes by their Pen; and no wonder therefore that they were Mercenary.

(a) Diff.  
p. 59.

It is objected, that if these Letters about the *Elegy* were *Phalaris's*, he would have express'd himself properly, and not have call'd the same Copy of Verses *μέλους*, and *ἐλεγέων*, which are as different from one another as *Theognis* is from *Pindar* (a): an Egregious Piece of Dulness! says the Dr, and which proves him to be a meer *Asinus ad Lyram*! Now to see the different Cast of Mens Heads, allowing the Error in this case, so Egregiously Dull am I, that I should have reason'd just the other way from it; that if a *Sophist* had writ these Letters, he would never have confounded these Two Words, the distinct Sence of which was so well settl'd before his Time by the Grammarians. But in *Phalaris's* time the meaning of these Terms of Art might not be so strictly mark'd out; or a Prince might not think himself oblig'd to take notice of it, and to write with all the Exactness of a Scholar. So that from this very Mistake, if it were one, I should have inferr'd something  
in



in favor of the Letters: but, to our Misfortune, here is no Mistake. *Phalaris* did but as a Nicer Man than He might have done; he calls the Poem *Ελεγεῖον* (a), when he asks it of *Stesichorus*, and did not know in what Verse it <sup>144</sup> would be compos'd by him; and he calls it *μῦλον* afterwards (b), when he had it, and (b) Ep. 79. found it was in Lyric Measures.

*Ἑλεγεῖον* and *Ελεγεῖον* originally signified only a Mournful or Funeral Song (c); an *Elegy*, as we say in *English*: referring to the Subject of the Song, and not to the Measure. But *Elegies* being generally writ in *Hexameters* and *Pentameters*, the Word came afterwards to be apply'd purely to the Measure, without any Regard to the Subject. However, this Second Sense of the Word did not so far prevail, as absolutely to extinguish the First; still *Ἑλεγεῖον* and *Ἑλεγεῖον* were now and then employ'd in a Looser Meaning than what the Grammarians put upon 'em: and of this I will give the Dr one plain Instance, from a Darling Author of his, *Dion Chrysostome*, who in his 4th Book *de Regno* calls the *Heroic Verses* written on *Sardanapalus's Tomb*, *Ἑλεγεῖον*: And *Aristophanes* speaking of the *Nightingale*, has this Passage:

σοῖς ἀκῶν τοῖς σοῖς ἐλέγοις  
Ἀντιφάλλει. In *Opus*.

Where *ἐλέγοις* can signifie nothing, but a *Me-lancholy*

(c) - *Elegia, flebile Carmen*:  
*Ab! nimis ex vero nunc tibi*  
*nomen habes!*

Ovid.

Καὶ οἱ Ἕλληνας δὲ ἔλε-  
γον, ὅ ἐστι *ἑλεγεῖον*, οἱ αὖτ' αὐλῶ,  
φασίν, ἦδοντο. Πένθιμον  
δὲ ἦν τὸ πρῶτον, φασίν, ὁ  
αὐλός. Eust. in Hom. Il. Ω.  
paulo ante finem.

(a) Accordingly the *Schooliaſt* thus interprets it. Τοῖς σέῃς ἐλέγιοις, ἀντὶ τῶν τοῖς ὁρίοις. Ἐιρηται ᾗ ἀπὸ τῶν ἑ, ἑ λέγειν.

*lancholy Tune*, or *Mournful Song* (a); unless our *Grammarian* can prove, that the *Nightingales* in that part of the *World* sung in *Elegiac Measure*. And the *Misfortune* of it is, that these very Ἐλέγιοι are call'd

μέλη but a few Verses before.

Τὸν ἑμὸν καὶ τὸν περὶ δακρυὸν Ἰππὺ  
Ἐλελιζομένην διερεῖς μάλασι.

And I hope *Aristophanes* understood Greek, and was no *Asinus ad Lyram*. As strong Proofs as these may seem, I have still behind One Authority more, which will go farther with Dr Bentley than any I have yet brought: 'tis his Own. He, p. 139, of his Dissertation, tells us, that Some-body made an Edition of *Æsop's Fables in Elegiac Verse*; and, after giving us several Instances of the kind, he adds, that Some of them (i. e. of the *Elegiac Fables*) were all in *Hexameters* (b). I'd advise him therefore to call in this Criticism, and his Dirty Proverb along with it, for fear it shou'd stick where he has not a mind it should.

(b) Differ.  
p. 140.

(b) Ibid.  
p. 60.

He has still One way left of disproving this Piece of *Putid Formality*; and that is, by denying that *Stesichorus* and *Phalaris* were acquainted (b): 'Tis a Negative, and therefore pretty hard to be made out; let us see how he sets about it. He observes, that *Lucian* says nothing of this Acquaintance. *Lucian* mentions it not by Name indeed; but he speaks in General of *Phalaris's* Conversation with Learned Men, and their great Esteem of him;

him; and then gives an Instance in *Pythagoras*, the most celebrated Scholar of his Time (a): and after Him, there needed no other Instances. Had a Less Skilful Hand been employ'd in making this Oration, he would probably have heap'd up all he knew of *Phalaris*, and overacted his part by too Great and Circumstantial a Nicety. But *Lucian*

(a) Ἐγὼ δὲ καὶ ἐξέπτη-  
δὲς φοιτῶν παρ' ἐμὲ αἱ σοφώ-  
ταις τῶν Ἑλλήνων, καὶ φεύ-  
γουν πρὸ συνουσίαν ἐμὴν  
ὡς περ' ἀμύλη καὶ πρῶτον ὁ  
Κορδὸς Πυθαγόρας ἦκεν ὡς  
ἡμᾶς, &c.

Luc. Phal. 1.

had more Art; he knew when to leave off, that the Piece might not look stiff and unnatural. Besides if *Lucian's* Silence be an Exception to *Stesichorus's* acquaintance with *Phalaris*, it is to *Abaris's* too; which yet Our Critic has before, for the sake of *Aristotle* and *Jamblichus* \*, been graciously pleas'd to allow. \* Differ.

But *Plato* is silent, as well as *Lucian*, in this P. 15. matter; and that in an Epistle written to a Tyrant of Sicily, where he is reckoning up the Friendships of Learned Men with Tyrants and Magistrates †. Neither has *Plato* mention'd † Ibid. any thing in that Epistle of the acquaintance P. 61. between *Phalaris* and *Pythagoras*; which had been as Proper, and as Domestic an Instance as the other. And yet the *Pythagoreans*, all agree that their Master and *Phalaris* were acquainted; and Dr *Bentley* grants it: why should *Plato's* Ill Memory be a proof against the one, and no Proof against the other? But I rather think, it was his Good Judgment, than his Ill Memory, that occasion'd this Omission: *Phalaris's* Name was detested and infamous in Sicily; and to have brought him in therefore among his other Instances, would have

have spoil'd the Complement to *Dionysius*, who might like well enough to have the Parallel drawn between Him and *Hiero*, or *Pericles*, or *Periander*, or *Cræsus*; but would not have thought it a Civility, I believe, to have been compar'd with *Phalaris*: whose Character, when taken at the best, and as drawn in these Epistles, is not so Amiable, as that any man should be pleas'd with resembling him; especially One, who could not but be conscious to himself, that he had made use of His Methods, and had reason to expect His Fate. *Plato* was a Great Master of Decency; and he never shew'd it more than in this dextrous management; which I am not surpriz'd to find that our Library-keeper has no Relish of.

His last Argument is from *Pindar*, who speaks of *Phalaris's* Cruelty with Detestation. And what follows from thence? that he never heard of his *Extraordinary Dearness with Stesichorus*; for the sake of which, *Pindar*, had he known it, would certainly have forbore giving him so Vile a Character (a). This indeed is Demonstration, and not to be withstood! I will not Attempt to answer it; only I will put the Dr in mind of One false Colour, that he has given to his Argument: for it does not appear from any Expression in this Ode, that *Pindar* is there exhorting *Hiero* to be kind to Poets and Men of Letters (b). There is not a Word of being kind to Poets and Men of Letters mention'd in the Verses themselves, whatever Guess his Commentators (who perhaps knew as little of *Pindar's* Intentions, as I or Dr Bentley do) may make at their Remote Mean-

(a) Differ.  
p. 61.

(b) Ibid.

Meaning. Pindar only praises *Hiero* for his Humanity and Hospitality, at large; and tells him, *Cræsus* was renown'd for these Virtues, and *Phalaris* infamous for the want of 'em. Which I would have observ'd; because if he be not speaking here of *Benevolence to Poets and Men of Letters*, Dr Bentley might as well have undertaken to prove his point from ἀριστὸν μὲν ἴδωρ, as from the passage he has produc'd. He has lam'd it in his Quotation; I will give it the Reader en-

tire (a): *Cræsus*, says he, will always be renown'd for his Humanity and Benevolence; but the Memory of the Savage and Inhuman *Phalaris* is every where

(a) Ὅτι φθίβει Κροίσος τι-  
λόφρων ἀρετῇ: ἢ δὲ Ταύρος  
καλ' ἔω καυτῆρα νηλεὲς νόον  
ἐχθρὰ Φάλαριν κατέχει παρ-  
τῇ φάπης.

detested. Could a better Panegyric be made upon *Hiero*, in fewer Words? Could any thing be more artful, than the pitching upon these Two Opposite Instances, to set out his Character by? Were a Man to Compliment some Person in Dr Bentley's Station, could he do it more effectually, than by saying of him, that he had all the Humanity and Good Nature of the Library-keeper at Cambridge \*, and none of the Disobliging Rude Qualities of Him at St James's? \* Mr. Laughlin.

After all, the Dr's Opinion and Mine upon this point are not so very distant as he may imagine: for I agree with him, that there was no *Extraordinary Dearness* between *Stesichorus* and *Phalaris*; nor do the Letters themselves imply that there was. They say indeed, that *Phalaris* oblig'd and courted *Stesichorus*, out of Vanity, or a Real Esteem of his Merit. And *Stesichorus* could not but pay some

some Regard to *Phalaris* on this account; tho' he could never Love Him, or his Character: nor is there any Proof from the Epistles, that he did. *Phalaris*, after he had given him his Life, desir'd only his Friendship in return; and *Stesichorus* was oblig'd both in Gratitude and Prudence, not to stand off; but to be in as Good Terms as he could with a Man that was able to do him so much Mischief. We have a Lively Account of just such a management as this between *Julius Caesar* and *Tully*, in the Epistles of the Latter. When *Caesar* had got the better of *Pompey*, whose Side *Tully* took, either out of a true Esteem for *Tully's* Vertues, or out of Design, he took all Methods of making him his Own; pay'd him a great many Civilities, and did him a great many Services. *Tully* could never from his Heart love a Tyrant: but we may imagine how he behav'd himself in this case; he accepted *Caesar's* proffer'd Friendship, wrote Civilly to him, and lay still. No more than this, that I can see, ever pass'd between *Stesichorus* and *Phalaris*, to speak upon the Foot of the Letters: and if so, what becomes of Dr *Bentley's* Harangue about the Silence of Authors, in relation to this fancied Intimacy and Dearness? Good Writers must needs say nothing of that which never happen'd. *Stesichorus's* Love for *Phalaris* could no more be the Subject of any of the Pens that went before us, than Dr *Bentley's* Humanity will be of any of the Pens that shall come after us. 'Tis Easie then to answer for the Silence of Authors upon This Head; whether it can be justified as well upon the Next, I shall now enquire.

I N

**I**N my Preface to *Phalaris*, among the Objections that might be rais'd against the Epistles, I mention'd this for One, that they had, for ought we knew, lain a *Thousand Years* without being taken notice of. Dr Bentley has been pleas'd to resume this slight Argument of mine, as he did that of the *Dialect*, and give it a place among his Irrefragable Demonstrations; an Honour which, I must own, it no ways deserves. For, tho' he has taken this occasion of shewing his Extraordinary Talent in Wit and Raillery, and tells us, the Epistles were preserv'd in the *Parchments* of Jove, and buried in some *Secret Cave* under Ground; or else they had certainly gone to Pot \*: yet I \* Differ: suppose he does not in good Earnest think p. 63. it any great Wonder, that Mortal Vellum should endure a *Thousand Years*; or that a small Parcel of Letters should lie so many Ages without being mention'd by any Author now extant: a Thing not altogether Incredible, because it has actually happen'd to other Books besides *Phalaris*.

*Velleius Paterculus*, an Elegant Writer, and one that tells us several Particulars, not to be met with in other Roman Historians, might with more reason expect to be taken notice of than our Author: yet perhaps Dr Bentley won't meet with any plain mention of his Writings for *Five Centuries* after he writ, till *Priscian* quotes him, and that only in a point of Grammar. After this time, he'll be as much at a loss to find any Footsteps of him for *Nine Hundred Years* more, down to the Age of *Aventinus*: and yet the Criticks

have receiv'd him without being so nice as to examine, what *Secret Cave* he was conceal'd in. *Phaedrus*, as far as I can find, was never mention'd by any Author since *Avienus*, till his Fables were in this Age brought to light by *Pithaeus*, after they had been lost above a Thousand Years. *Lactantius de Mortibus Persecutorum*, was a Book not spoken of by any-body since *St Jerome*, till, after a Thousand Years, *Baluze* discover'd it in the famous Library of *Colbert*, and made it publick. Now, as our Dissertator learnedly argues; if these Books lay untouch'd and unstirr'd, they must have moulder'd away; if they were us'd during these Ten Centuries, Somebody would surely have spoken of 'em. Either the Dr must give up these Authors as Spurious, or these Objections as Slight and Frivolous; and own, that the Silence of the Ancients is not a *Direct*, but (as any-body else would have thought; and call'd it) a very *Indirect* Argument against 'em: tho' still not quite so indirect as another; that he founds upon a Disagreement between *Lucian*, and the *Epistles*, in their Accounts of *Phalaris*. This does not come properly under the head I am now speaking to: however, because he has thrown together here Two or Three Poultry Proofs, that would make no Figure by themselves, I shall take 'em as they lie before me. The Different Relations concerning *Phalaris* given by *Lucian*, and the *Epistles*, I urg'd formerly, \* as a Proof that *Lucian* could not write them. But as He has manag'd it, at second hand, to shew, that *Lucian* does as good as expressly declare

he

\* Preface  
to my Edition of  
*Phalaris*.



he never saw 'em, it either proves nothing, or proves too much ; even that *Lucian* never saw *Timæus*, as Learned as he was, and as often as he mentions him. For *Timæus* relates, that the *Agrigentines* threw the *Brazen Bull* into the Sea ; but *Lucian* says, *Phalaris* sent it to *Delphos*. What I should gather from hence would be, that *Lucian* overlook'd that and many other Authorities, and did not confine himself to strict History in a Declamation : but, according to Dr *Bentley's* manner of drawing Consequences it must follow, that *Timæus* no more writ his History, than *Phalaris* did his Letters ; for *Lucian* equally contradicts Both ; and for that reason is a Bad Evidence against either of them. Now if *Lucian* himself be of no Authority in his point, much less are those Authors he follow'd \* ; which Dr *Bentley* summons up as so many Witnesses against the Epistles. I would ask him how many Witnesses these are ? where they liv'd ? what are their Names, and the Names of the Books they wrote ? 'Tis very hard to urge such Testimonies against us, as are not now, and probably never were in being : For *Lucian*, in this Harangue, seems to tie himself up to no Authors, nor to be guided by any thing but his own Invention : and this the Dr himself confesses in another place † ; where he says, *Lucian feigns an Embassy from Phalaris to Delphi*. And if the Ground of this whole Discourse were a Fiction, why does the Dr here argue from it as seriously as if it were copy'd from the most Authentic Histories then extant ? how can he allow himself to put such an Air of Gravity upon what he

\* Dissert.  
p. 65.

† Dissert.  
p. 62.

knows to be a Trifle ? We shall have him, at this rate, in his next Dissertation, solemnly quoting *Lucian's Vera Historia* too, and the unknown *Authors which he follow'd*. But I suppose he resolv'd to make the best advantage he could of these Poor Colours, for want of Better Authorities : For the Two Historians he brings to strengthen his Proof, say nothing that is inconsistent with the Epistles. Jamblichus, he says, *brings in Abaris in company with Pythagoras to Phalaris ; but in the Epistles Abaris refuses to come*. Who would not have refus'd an Invitation from *Phalaris*, till he had good assurances that he might come with Safety ? Report had told him very dismal Stories of the Tyrant, and dress'd him up in frightful Colours ; *Abaris* perhaps did not know at first, but that *Phalaris* might Live upon Philosophers Flesh ; or might have a Fancy to try, which made his Bull Roar best, a *Scythian*, or a *Sicilian*. These were very Important matters, and if he should not have taken care to be fully satisfied in 'em before he ventur'd his Person, he had not been quite so *Wise* a man as he was thought to be ; for one part of Wisdom is to be *Cautious*. *Pythagoras* therefore manag'd at the very same rate : he often refus'd to come (a), and yet came at last : why might not this be the case of *Abaris* ? This is a very easie way of reconciling *Phalaris* with *Jamblichus* ; and he does not differ so widely from *Heraclides* neither, but that They too may be brought (with Dr Bentley's Leave, and in his *Carriers* Phrase) to set *Horses* together. *Phalaris* says, he was an *Orphan*, before he came to *Agrigent* ;  
and

(a) Ep.  
LXXIV.

and yet *Heraclides* says, his Mother was burnt there. Dr *Bentley* has given a Clear Solution of this Difficulty himself; and frankly owns, that his Mother might be burnt, tho' his Father dy'd long before. But how, says he, came the Old Woman to be roasted at Agrigent, if Phalaris fled alone from *Astypalæa*, neither Wife nor Child, nor any Relation following him, according to the Epistles (a)? I do not re-<sup>(a) Differ.</sup> member any such Epistle in My Edition of *Phalaris*; but if there should be such an one in the King's MS, I'll answer this Objection to it, when the Library-keeper is in so good an Humor, as to favour me with a Sight of it: Till then, I may be excus'd from prosecuting this Point any further. Only I must observe to the Dr, that either he uses some Copy of *Heraclides* that I have not seen; or else cites him for what he does not say. Both Here, and in the 30th Page of his Dissertation, he tells us, from *Heraclides*, that *Phalaris* was burnt by the *Agrigentines*; whereas *Heraclides* only says, *ὁ δὲ Σήμας ἐπυράσθη* *Cato*. 'Tis true, it's all one to his purpose, whether he was burnt, or any other way put to Death: but he has such a Facility of Misunderstanding or Misrepresenting Authors, to serve a Turn; that he does it, even when it is of no service to him.

I Hope I have now so thoroughly examin'd Dr Bentley's *General Arguments*; that none of 'em can be thought to affect the whole Body of the Epistles: if his Objections against some *Particular Letters* have no more Weight in 'em, he's the best Patron *Phalaris* has yet met with; for the next Happiness to being very well Defended, is that of being very weakly Oppos'd. All his Attacks of this kind are ground'd upon *Chronology*: and therefore, before he could make any Approaches, he was oblig'd to settle the Time of *Phalaris*. And first he gives us the account of *Eusebius* thus. "Ol. XXXI. 2. *Phalaris apud Agrigentinos Tyrannidem exercet*. Ol. XXXVII. "2. *Phalaridis Tyrannis destructa*: by which "reckoning he govern'd 28 Years \*. Instead of Ol. XXXVII, he means, I suppose, Ol. XXXVIII, as 'tis in *Eusebius*; or else his Reckoning of 28 Years (which he could bring in here, for no other Reason, but to shew his Skill in Counting) is false. However, he is willing to allow, that (according to *St Hierome*, and *Suidas*) *Phalaris's Government* commenc'd Ol. LIII. 3. and expir'd Ol. LVII. 3. This account, says he, I allow of for the sake of *Aristotle* and *Jamblichus*, who make him Contemporary with *Stesichorus* and *Pythagoras* †. But by his Niceness in Computation he confutes himself in the same Breath, and says, *Pythagoras was not taken notice of in Greece till 80 Years after Ol. XXXVIII. 2.* (for I'll suppose XXXVII a false Print) i. e. Three Years after

\* Dissert.  
p. 14.

† Ibid.  
p. 15.

ter *Phalaris* dy'd. And yet *Pythagoras* had a great Name in *Greece* many Years before he came into *Sicily*. So that *Dr Bentley* has manag'd this Point with a particular Dexterity; and prov'd that *Pythagoras* and *Phalaris* could not be acquainted, by that very account which he accepted of meerly to countenance their acquaintance. A most auspicious Entrance upon his Chronological Proofs! doubtless all the rest will be made out with Equal Force and Clearness! Here's a Page spent to give us his Opinion about the Age of *Phalaris*, where he has so contriv'd to say one thing, and prove another, that we are still at a loss to know what his Opinion is. If *Dr Bentley* be so Quarrelsome, that he cannot agree with himself, how is it possible for other People to agree with him? I would willingly allow of any Date of *Phalaris* that he is inclin'd to admit: but since he has express'd himself so intricately, that 'tis hard to know which way he is determin'd, I'll take the most receiv'd Account; and go on to shew, that, notwithstanding any of *His Discoveries*, the Epistles might have been written before the 58th Olympiad.

He begins his Chronological Observations with the *Era's* of some Cities mention'd in the Epistles; a very Slippery Foundation to build an Argument upon! for all these Cities are so very ancient, that it would puzzle one of a Greater Reach in Chronology than *Dr Bentley*, to trace their Originals. The Oldest Historians now extant had but very Slender Memoirs of those times; and

accordingly we find their Accounts so confus'd and contradictory, that No-body but a Man of Dr *Bentley's* Judgement would pretend to draw Demonstrations from 'em. I hear the Famous Mr *Adams* (who surpasses Dr *Bentley* in Learning as much as he does in Candour and Modesty) is now printing some Lectures at *Oxford*, in which he shews, how very obscure and uncertain the Histories of those Ages are; and that from the Concurrence of those Rude Accounts he meets with, he has made it probable that *Phalaris* must be brought much lower than even St *Hierome* places him. This perhaps would cut off most of the Drs Arguments at one Blow: but for want of this assistance, I must encounter 'em singly; and be content to wander with him thro' those Woods and Mazes in which he often loses both Himself and his Reader. But before I follow him into this Dark Scene, I will consider a little the Tendency of this way of arguing in General. He would prove that *Phalaris* could not possibly be the Author of these Letters, because some Places are mention'd there under such Names, as he thinks were given 'em since the Age of *Phalaris*. Does he know Whose this sort of Proof is, and to what Ill Purposes it has been employ'd? it is famous for being made use of by *Spinoza*, and others, to ruine the Authority of *Moses's* Writings; which they would prove not to be His (just as our Chronologer here does) from Places being mention'd in 'em, more Modern than He. Ought the Dr in a Doubting Age to have employ'd such an Argument, without  
the

the utmost Caution and Guard? Ought he to have propos'd it so Generally and Cruelly, without informing his Reader, how far it held, and where it fail'd? what Exceptions were necessary to be made to it, and of what Solutions it was capable? Is he so Eager to prove *Phalaris* Spurious, that he cares not whether the Authority of the Sacred Writings sink with him? But I hope he does not think there's any more Weight in *Spinosa's*, than I think there is in His Arguments. One of the Answers I have heard given upon this occasion is, that these Names were changed since *Moses* writ, to make his History more intelligible to those, to whom the ancient Names of these Towns and Countries were no longer known. And this Plea therefore I might fairly lay hold of for *Phalaris*, if there were any need of it; and presume that the Copyers of these Letters might alter some of the Old Names to such as were of more known and familiar Use in their Time. But I have no occasion to say this, till Dr *Bentley* has clearly prov'd some of the Names of Cities mention'd there to be later than *Phalaris*; which, I think, with all his little Skill in puzzling Accounts, he has not been able to do.

For Methods sake, he begins at the Last Epistle; from whence he cites these words; ὁ σοφιστὴς καὶ φησὶν, and says, the Sophist was careful to mention such Cities (he means, People) as he knew were in Sicily (a). Which is unluckily said just in this Place, because the Sophist (if he be one) happens to mention a People that were not in Sicily; for in all the

(a) P. 15.

the Copies of *Phalaris* 'tis *Ῥαλαῖος*. Indeed I guess'd it should be *Ῥελαῖος*, and am therefore oblig'd not to bear hard upon him for making use of my Conjecture. Granting it therefore to be *Ῥελαῖος*, whether any of the *Sicilian Hybla's* be here meant is dubious, and therefore he says nothing to it: but when he comes to *Phintia*, which every body owns to be in *Sicily*, he brings abundance of needless Authorities to prove 'tis there. One of these, *Diodorus*, says, that *Phintia* was built by *Phintias* of *Agrigent*, long enough after the Time of *Phalaris*; upon which Dr Bentley begins to triumph a little too hastily; imagining, he has certainly prov'd this to be the *Phintia* mention'd by the Mock-*Phalaris*. Whereas he ought to have consider'd, that *Diodorus*, in the very place he cites, says, that the *Phintia* built by *Phintias* was a *Maritime Town*\*: but there's another *Phintia*, which both *Ptolemy* (b), and *Pliny* (c) tell us is a *Mediterranean Town*. Now if *Phalaris's* Friends should be as Positive as Dr Bentley sometimes is with less reason, that 'tis the *Mediterranean Phintia* that's mention'd in this Epistle, how would he disprove 'em? This has certainly as good a Title to be there as his *Maritime Phintia* has; nay, according to his way of arguing in the next Paragraph from the Company that Towns keep, the case is evident in its favour; for *Hybla*, which it is here joyn'd with, is *Mediterranean*. Perhaps the Dr will bravely stand to what he has here inconsiderately said, that all these Authors mean the same place: if so, (which I am far from Granting) why may not *Diodorus*

\* Ῥελαῖος  
 Ῥελαῖος ἢ Ῥελαῖος.  
 (b) Geogr.  
 l. 3. c. 4.  
 (c) Nat.  
 Hist. l. 3.  
 c. 8.



dorus be mistaken as much in the Date of this Town, as two Good Witnesses prove him to be in the Situation of it? unless this *Phintia* be such another Place as *Agrigent*, a Sea-port Town in the middle of *Sicily* \*.

\* Differt.

From *Phintia* the Dr marches on victoriously to *Alæsa*; where he finds *Stesichorus* in danger of being snapt †, in his intended Journey from thence to *Himera*. And here again he appeals to *Diodorus*, whether there was any such place as *Alæsa* in the Days of *Phalaris*. *Diodorus* gives him a less satisfactory answer than he did in the Case of *Phintia*; and tells him, that there was indeed one *Alæsa* built by *Archonides* in the 94th Olymp. (which, according to the Dr's Arithmetick, is above 120; another man would have said, above 140 Years after the last Period of *Phalaris*) but that there were several other *Alæsa's* in *Sicily*; and therefore *Archonides* gave this City the Appellation of *Archonidium*. So that we are at liberty to chuse any other of those *Alæsa's* for *Phalaris*; unless Dr Bentley by his Arbitrary Power can confine us to *Archonidium*. He says he can, and by this Stratagem: *Alæsa* is here joyn'd with *Himera* and *Aluntium*; and the *Alæsa* of *Archonides* is upon the same Coast with these Two Cities: therefore 'tis evident from the Situation that this *Alæsa* of *Archonides* is meant in the Epistles. A Surprising Argument! and I verily believe his Own! if he be not too unreasonably fond of it, I desire to borrow it for One Moment, to prove just the contrary to what He has prov'd; that this *Alæsa* is not upon the same Coast with *Aluntium*. Tully says; *Halesini*,  
Ca-

\* Or. in  
Verr.

*Catanenses, Panormitani, &c, and agen, Halesini, Cavanense, Tyndaritani, &c.* \* 'Tis Evident therefore that *Alasa* is upon the same Coast with *Catana*; that is upon the Coast directly opposite to *Aluntium*. I could confound all the Geographers in the World with this Argument, but must detain it no longer; I return it to the Dr with Thanks, and with a Promise never to use it again. If any-body be of so slow a Judgment, as not to be affected with the evidence of this proof, the Dr, who is a man that guards against all possible Cavils and Exceptions, has another ready to support it; which plainly shews, that the *Alasa* of *Archonides* must be meant in the Epistles, because there was no other Town of that name in the days of the Sophist †. The Question is, whether these Epistles could be written by *Phalaris*? No, says Dr Bentley; because the *Alasa* of *Archonides* is mention'd there. But how does it appear, that, among the several *Alasa*'s in Sicily, this of *Archonides* must needs be meant there? That, says he, is plain; because there was no other Town of that name in the days of the Sophist: i. e. If a Sophist writ these Letters, he must needs mean the *Alasa* of *Archonides*, because there was no other then standing. But the Dr forgets that he is disputing with a strange sort of People who won't allow that a Sophist writ these Letters; and if he could prove that a Sophist writ 'em, they would still deny his Consequence: for might not a Sophist mention a Town he had read of, tho' 'twas not standing in his time? If he might not, 'twill follow, that a Sophist could not write these Epistles, where we find

† Differ.  
p. 17.

find the names of *Astypalea, Himera, Zancle, &c.* Towns out of Date long before the days of the Sophist. It has been the Dr's fortune in this Section, to use such perverse arguments, as will sooner serve to any purpose than to what he applies 'em. Instead of proving the Epistles Spurious, he has prov'd 'em Genuine; instead of settling the true place of one City, he has unsettled all the Geography that ever was writ.

However he is not discourag'd with this ill Success at *Alasa*, but proceeds to give Battle to the *Zancleans*, upon the strength of an old saying and a true, *πολλὰ γὰρ τὰ πλέμνι* (a), (a) Differ. *Phalaris* in the 85th Epistle says, *ταυρομενέτας* P. 30. *ὁ Ζαγκλαίος ἐστὶ τὴν νεβίαννα* and inscribes the 21st Epistle *Μεσσηνίοις*; upon which Dr Bentley makes this Remark: *Here we have mention made of Zancleans and Messenians, as if Zancle and Messana were two different Towns* (b): and (b) Ibid. *agen, the Zancleans, by the reckoning of Pausanias, had been an obsolete forgotten Word 100 Years before the date of these pretended Epistles* (c). If the Author had mention'd *Zan-* (c) Differ. *cle and Messana* too, Dr Bentley might have P. 27. said with some Grounds that he mistook 'em for two different Towns: but to say, he did so, from his mentioning the *Zancleans* and *Messanians*, is a Consequence too nearly related to some we have lately parted with. For from the *Messanians* taking *Zancle*, and calling it after their own Name, does it follow, that there were no *Zancleans* left in the World? Were these poor people annihilated upon the Loss of their City? A man less rash in pronouncing their Name forgotten and obsolete might

might have Suspected, and a man better acquainted with History might have Known, that they continued many Ages in a Distinct Body, and under the same Name. *Pausanias* (a), where he observes, that during the

(a) *Eliac.*  
p. 346.

*Messenians* absence from *Peloponnese*, but Two of their Nation won the Prize at the *Olympicks*, adds, that the *Sicilians* say these were not *Messenians*, but descended

\* *Οἱ δὲ Σικελιώται καὶ τέτρες  
τῶν ἀρχαίων Ζαγκλαίων, καὶ  
Μεσσηνίων φασί.*

from the old *Zancleans* \*. This implies, that the *Zancleans* were not swallow'd up by the *Messenians*, but kept their

Families unmix'd with their new Conquerors. And this appears more clearly from

† *Lib. 11.*

*Diodorus*, who tells us †, that in the 79th Olympiad the *Zancleans* recovered their City out of these Strangers hands, that had possess'd it so many Years. Nay, so far were the *Zancleans* from being *obsolete* 100 Years before *Phalaris*, that we are sure they preserv'd themselves in a Separate Body even

\* *L. 3. c. 8.*

till \* *Pliny's* time, who expressly distinguishes 'em from the *Messanians*; and tells us, *Messana* was a Free City, but the *Zancleans* were

† *Messana*  
*Civium*  
*Romanorum*  
*qui*  
*Mamertini*  
*vocantur*;  
*Latina*  
*conditionis*  
*Zanclexi.*

Tributaries †. These Testimonies will sufficiently justify *Phalaris* for mentioning the *Zancleans*; and if we can bring him off as well for mentioning the *Messanians*, that inexcusable Ignorance in this matter, which Dr Bentley presses so hard upon the Sophist, must lie at his own Door, till he can remove it. But this, the Dr says, *Thucydides* will not suffer, who relates that, at the time of *Xerxes's Expedition*, *Anaxilaus King of Rhegium* besieg'd *Zancle*, and took it; and call'd it *Messana*.

*Thuc.*

*Thucydides* \* says indeed that *Anaxilaus* beat \* L. 5. 5. out the *Samians* from *Zancle*, and call'd it *Messana*; but fixes the time of this action no otherwise than only by saying, 'twas not long after the *Samians*, flying from the *Medes*, possess'd it. Dr *Bentley* calls this *Xerxes's* Expedition; as if the *Medes* had never made an Incurſion, upon *Greece*, till the time of *Xerxes*. I don't know how he will excuse himself for misrepresenting that excellent Author, but only by pleading that he has dealt as freely with others. For, after the Words last quoted from *Thucydides*, he adds; the same says *Herodotus*; whereas what *Herodotus* † says, is † L. 6. so far from being the same, that it contradicts both the Story which *Thucydides* himself tells, and that which Dr *Bentley* makes for him. For *Herodotus* says, not that *Anaxilaus* expell'd the *Samians* from *Zancle*, but that he assisted 'em to take it; not that this was done at the time of *Xerxes's* Expedition, but in the Reign of *Darius*. A Common Reader would be surpriz'd to hear him profess, immediately after these Two fair Citations, that he loves to deal ingenuously (a): but I be- (a) Differ. gin now to understand his Figurative Ex- P. 25. pressions; when he offers an argument, that has no Consequence, or Meaning in it, then his Phrase is, 'tis Evident; When he has transcrib'd two or three Pages together from another man, then he crys out a Discovery; and when he would put a false Colour upon any thing, then he loves to deal ingenuously. But to deal a little more ingenuously than He does, I will give his Authorities all the force

force that they will bear, tho' not all that he lays upon em; and then consider how far the Positive Testimony of *Pausanias* may prevail against 'em. That *Anaxilaus* chang'd the Name of *Zancle* into *Messana* is agreed between Dr Bentley and Me; the only question is about the Date of this Change. *Thucydides* fixes upon no date: *Diodorus* places the Death of One *Anaxilaus* in the 76th Olympiad; but does not say, this was the *Anaxilaus* that nam'd *Messana*. *Herodotus*, in the place cited, says nothing about the Change of the Names, but tells a Story of the *Samians* seizing *Zancle*, a little after *Miletus* was taken; that is, about the 70th Olympiad: and all the Ground we have, from this Passage of *Herodotus*, to conclude the Change of the Name *Zancle* into *Messana* to have happened after this time, is, his calling the City *Zancle*, and not *Messana*, throughout this Story: which I think, proves nothing more, than that the Old Name was not yet so utterly abolish'd, but that it was call'd indifferently either *Zancle* or *Messana* still: and this I take to be the most Natural In-

terpretation of another Passage in *Herodotus* \*, (which I shall produce in Terms because Dr Bentley has not) where, having occasion to mention *Zancle*, after the *Samians* had possess'd it, he calls it *Zancle* still; only letting us know,

that it had also a New Name, *Messana*. So that hitherto we have had no direct and positive Testimony about the Time of *Zancle's* changing

\* Ο Κλέμης —  
 ὄρχετο εἰς Σικελίῳ ἐνθα μὲν  
 Σαμίαν ἐχέ τε καὶ κατοικη-  
 σι πάλιν Ζάγκλῳ, πῶς εἰς  
 Μεσσηνίῳ μεταβὰς τὸν ὄνομα  
 L. 7. §. 164.

changing its Name. *Pausanias* is the only Author, that speaks fully up to the point; and He expressly affirms this to have happen'd in the 29th Olympiad, and tells the Story with a great deal of Solemnity and Circumstance. He says, the Flight of those *Messeni-ans* [who nam'd *Messana*] was after the taking of *Ira* by the *Lacedamonians*, in the 28th Olympiad, when *Chionis* the Spartan carried the Prize the first time (a): that, (a) P. 259, upon their Flight, *Anaxilaus* Prince of *Rhe-<sup>260.</sup>*  
*gium*, who had War with the *Zancleans*, invited 'em to joyn with him; that they did so, and together with his Forces took *Zan-  
 cle*; and had it given 'em to inhabit, and new nam'd it *Messana*, in the 29th Olympiad; when the same *Chionis* won the Prize the Se-  
 cond time (b). That this *Anaxilaus* was the (b) P. 260,  
 Great Grandson of *Alcidamidas*, who fled <sup>261.</sup>  
 with his Family from *Messene* to *Rhegium*, after the taking of *Ithome*, and the Death of  
*Aristodemus* (c); which happen'd ( he tells us (c) P. 260.  
 in another place \* ) the first Year of the 14th \* P. 251.  
 Olympiad, that is about *Threescore Years* before; so that all the little particulars of *Pau-  
 sanias*'s whole Story are adjusted with the ut-  
 most exactness: He speaks home to the point;  
 so, as to leave no possible room for interpret-  
 ing his Words to any other Sense; and we  
 have as much reason to depend upon him in  
 This, as in Any *Æra* of Chronology what-  
 ever that he has laid down throughout his  
 Writings. And that *Pausanias*, who gives us  
 this account, was not unacquainted with what

\* Τὸν δὲ Σμικυθὸν τῶν  
 τῶν Ἡρόδοτος ἐστὶν ἐν τοῖς  
 λόγοις, ὡς Ἀναξίλα τῶ ἐν  
 Ῥηγίῳ περιγνήτῳ, &c.

Eliac. p. 340.

*Herodotus* had said, appears from his quoting *Herodotus* \*, in relation to *Micythus*, the Servant of *Anaxilaus*: so that this cannot be thought an

Error of his, owing to his want of Memory, or sufficient Light; but his fix'd and settled Judgment after the Matter had been by him thoroughly consider'd: And doubtless, when he laid down this Account so peremptorily and with so much Exactness, he had such Authorities in his View, as he judg'd sufficient to bear him out in it; and to be more than a Counterpoise to the Testimony of *Herodotus*; which he rejects, not only as to the Age of *Anaxilaus*, but as to the Circumstances of his Life also; giving us a very different relation of them. The most Eminent Chronologers, and Men best vers'd in these things, (having never seen that whole Tenor of History confirm'd by so many Synchronisms and Concurrences, which, I suppose, Dr Bentley keeps by him in reserve) fall in with this account of *Pausanias*. *Obbo Emmius* follows it, in his *History of Ancient Greece* (a); *Lydiat*, in his Notes on the *Chronicon Marmoreum*; *Joseph Scaliger*, in his (b) *P. 27. Animadversions upon Eusebius* (b); and in his *Ἀναξαρτὴ Ὀλυμπιάδων* †: So does *Petavius* too (c), who never agrees with *Scaliger* when he can help it; and *Meursius* (d), who has a distinct Chapter on this Subject. To sum up our Evidence then; against an Indirect and Dubious Proof, built

(a) L. 1.  
 p. 18.

(b) P. 27. *Animadversions upon Eusebius*

† It was compos'd by Scaliger himself, tho' many Learned Men have quoted it since, as an Ancient Piece.

(c) Rat. Temp. par. 1.  
 p. 38.

(d) Left. Att. l. 2. c. 23.



built chiefly on a Disputable Passage in *Herodotus*, we have the express, and full, and undoubted Authority of *Pausanias*; and the Opinions of *Ubbo Emmius*, *Lydiat*, *Scaliger*, *Petavius*, and *Meursius*, to counterpoise Dr Bentley's: and if these are not Enough to do it, I promise the Dr to throw half a dozen more into the Scale, the next time he and I talk together.

In the same Epistle, from whence Dr Bentley took an occasion of giving us this large and ingenuous account of *Zancle* and *Messana*, the *Tauromenites* were mention'd with the *Zancleans*; [*Ταυρομενίταις, καὶ Ζανκλεῖσι. τὰς δὲ περικλήσας*] upon which I expected, that, when he had dispatch'd the *Zancleans*, he would have fallen upon the *Tauromenites*: but to shew his Aversion to any thing that looks like Order or Method, he postpones 'em, to intermix some Proofs of a different Nature. I have already excus'd my self from following him in his Rambles, and shall consider *Tauromenium* here in its proper place. The only Authority he has brought to prove *Tauromenium* so nam'd since the time of *Phalaris*, is that of *Diodorus*, which I mention'd in my Preface; and own'd to be a clear Proof against *Phalaris*, if it might be rely'd on. But *Diodorus* is in two Stories, which, as Dr Bentley (after his way of citing Authors) has put 'em together, look plausibly enough; but as *Diodorus* himself tells 'em, are utterly inconsistent. In his 14th Book he says, that some *Sicilians* planted themselves upon *Taurus*, and from their Settlement there call'd the place they built;

*Tauromenium*: In the 16th Book, he says, that about 40 Years after this, *Andromachus* planted some of the Old *Naxians* upon *Taurus*; and from his long stay there call'd the place where he planted 'em, *Tauromenium*. Thus *Diodorus* plainly gives us Two different accounts of the Time when the Place was nam'd; either of which, I confess, would serve Dr Bentley's purpose: but since they contradict one another, neither of them is to be depended on. If Dr Bentley pleads, that they do not contradict one-another, because the Place might be twice call'd so, for One and the same Reason; why will not the Same Reason equally hold for its being call'd so, long before *Phalaris* liv'd? Doubtless the *Sicilians* had often before his time resorted to the Strong Holds of that Mountain. Nay,

(2) L. 6.  
§ 15.

*Thucydides* expressly tells us (a), that there were of old People that inhabited the Hilly parts about *Naxos*: and 'tis not improbable, that These might be call'd *Tauρομενίται* before they were form'd into any Politick Body; and afterwards, when they were collected together, and a City was built (tho' we don't know when that was) that City might be call'd *Tauromenium*. 'Tis observable that *Phalaris*, tho' he has very often occasion to mention these People, yet never names any such Town as *Tauromenium*; never calls 'em *Citizens*, nor uses any such Expression as implies, they belong'd to any City. This could scarce have happen'd, if a Sophist had writ these Letters: but 'tis no wonder that *Phalaris* should write so; because there might be *Tauromenites*, as there was a River

*Tauρο-*

*Tauromenius* (if *Vibius Sequester* be to be credited, who says the Town had its name from thence) before there was a *Tauromenium*. So that *Dr Bentley* would have no reason to triumph over the Defenders of *Phalaris*, if he could prove *Tauromenium* of a Later Date; much less, since he cannot prove it, ought he so insultingly to call upon 'em, *Where are those that cry up Phalaris for the florid Author of these Letters, who was burnt in his Own Bull above 150 Years before Tauromenium was ever thought of* (a)? E're I answer this Question, I desire to ask Him one: *P. 31.*

Where does he find that *Phalaris* was burnt in his *Bull*? Does this Great Historian take up with the Trifling Author of the Verses upon *Ibis*; when so many Grave Writers have given us a different account of *Phalaris's* Death? In another place indeed he cites *Heraclides* for this Story; but, as I have already observ'd, falsely. However, *Phalaris's* being burnt in his *Bull* before *Tauromenium* was thought on, was so refreshing a Quibble, that he would rather venture upon False History, than lose it. The Witticism is something remote, as it stands here; but when he is at leisure to put this Dissertation into Latin, 'twill receive a Great Advantage.

Was not to be hop'd, that these Obscure Points concerning the *Building and Peopling Ancient Towns* should be so far clear'd and settl'd, as to make 'em amount to a Plain and Direct Proof against the Epistles : However it was a piece of Learning not unworthy of a Scholars Pains; and by a Skilful Hand might have been made useful to some Other purpose. I would not therefore be thought to disparage Dr Bentley for enquiring into this matter, tho' he has happen'd to leave it more obscure than he found it; His Attempt was Commendable, whatever his Success has been : but Now, methinks, he stoops very low; from the Rise and *Era's of Cities*, to the *Chronology of Old Sayings and Proverbs*. This would make a much more suitable *Appendix* to a *Vocabulary*, than to an *History of Ancient and Modern Learning*. 'Tis so dry and fruitless, and so little to the Purpose, that I am almost tempted to break my promise, and leave this part of his Dissertation unexamined. While Men of Different Times have a Like Frame of Soul, and meet with Like Accidents of Life, *i. e.* while they have the same Faculties, and the same Occasions of thinking, what Wonder is it, that they should happen upon the same Reflection? or that Authors, who write the same Language, and upon the same Subject, should put the same Two Words together? Yet this is what astonishes Dr Bentley; he cannot believe, that there should be so strange a

Jump-

*Jumping of Good Wits*, without some filching\*: \* Differ. and therefore concludes, these Letters must *P. 33.* be writ, not by *Phalaris* himself, but by a Secretary (*a*) of his; who is not so Dutiful as (*a*) *Ibid.* a Secretary should be in attending his Master, *P. 38.* for he comes a Thousand Years after him.

The Dr takes this Secretary tripping (*b*) in (*b*) *Ibid.* his use of the Proverb *πρὸς δίκην*, of which *P. 27.* the Dr can prove *Craesus* to be the Author; because, when he sent a Message to the *Lampsaceni*, that if they did not set *Miltiades* free, he would extirpate 'em *πρὸς δίκην*, the men of *Lampsacus* understood not the meaning of that Expression; The Phrase, he says, puzzled the whole City (*c*): What if it did? must an Expression needs be New and Unheard of, because the Mayor and Aldermen of *Lampsacus*, and perhaps the Recorder too, did not apprehend it? But how does he prove, it puzzled the WHOLE City? plainly! because One of the Eldest Citizens hit upon't, and told the meaning of it. This is very Nice Reasoning: but he goes on to refine upon it; and suspects that *Herodotus* himself was the first Broacher of that Expression: for (says he) those first Historians made every-bodies Speeches for 'em. Therefore *Herodotus* made this, which is no Speech, but only a Message! However, let *Herodotus* have worded this Message; does the same *Herodotus* tell us, that the *Lampsacenes* were puzzled with an Expression invented by *Herodotus*? Were the Men of *Lampsacus* in *Craesus's* time at a Loss to understand a Phrase, that was not thought of, till *Herodotus* an Hundred Years afterwards

coin'd it? 'Tis wonderful to Me, how such a Piece of Reasoning as this could ever enter into an Head that has Brains in it! All the Dr has to countenance it, is the Title of a *Lost Chapter* in *Gellius*; from whence he takes occasion to guess at what's *Lost* there, and to give us a wrong Translation of what's *Left*: *Casam*, which in *Herodotus's* Greek is ἐκκοπή, he renders *Lop'd*, instead of *Cut down*: Now, that a Pine-tree perishes by *Lopping*, is, I believe, News to the Naturalists. I could not avoid taking notice of this little Mistake because he repeats it over and over again; and endeavours, in his awkward way, to squeeze Mirth out of it. *Gellius* indeed, remembering a Passage in *Herodotus*, where it was affirm'd, that the Pine was the only Tree, which would not shoot out after it was cut down, might say, *Quod parum verè dixerit Herodotus*, &c. because he did not nicely examin upon what Occasion this was brought in by *Herodotus*; or what was said in *Herodotus*, he might in a Quotation say well enough, was said by him: but to tell us the Story of the *Lampsacenes* being at a Loss to understand the Message of *Cræsus*, and yet to think this Expression first broach'd by *Herodotus*, is such an Instance of *Oscitation* (a), as I could not easily imagine, that even Our Dissertator could be guilty of. He tells us of *Dreaming Pedants*, with their *Elbows on their Desks*; but surely the Man that writ this must have been fast asleep; or else his Imagination could never have rambled at this rate. If *Herodotus* is to be believ'd, *Cræsus*  
us d

(a) P. 119. tion (a), as I could not easily imagine, that

us'd this Expression ; if he is not to be believ'd, why is he brought to prove any thing? *Herodotus* is so far from asserting that *Cræsus* was the Author of this Proverbial Saying, that from this very Story we may gather, that he was not the Author of it ; For when he sent a Message to the *Lampsacenes*, which he expected should immediately be obey'd, would he put it into such a Phrase as they were not likely to apprehend ? It stands to reason, that he thought the Expression Common enough ; or else he would not have us'd it on this occasion. All that we certainly learn from *Herodotus* is, that this Saying must be as Old, at least, as *Cræsus* ; from whence one would be apt to conclude it to be probably as Old as *Phalaris*, who is plac'd but very few Years above him.

When the Dr's head ran upon Old Sayings, how came *Nihil est dictum quod non dictum prius*, to escape him ? This One, well apply'd, would have done him more service than all the *Greek, Latin, and English* Proverbs with which he embellishes his Dissertation ; it would have shew'd him, how vain it is to pretend to trace the Originals of Words and Phrases ; and that even the *Ages* of Cities may be fix'd much sooner than They. However the Dr launches still out into further Discoveries of this kind ; he has met with a Sentence of Moral \*, *ἀόγῳ ἐργασία* : \* Differ. which notable Saying, he tells us, had not *Phalaris* modestly hinted that Others had said it before him, we might have taken for his Own. He seems here to blame *Phalaris* for being modest, and for hinting that he borrow'd this Expression

pression from *others*, when he might as well have put it upon us for his *own*: the Dr I believe will never be blam'd upon either of these accounts. But would he really have taken this Saying for *Phalaris's* Own, if there had been no hint of his borrowing it? and yet when *Phalaris* says, 'tis Older than himself, will he take it to be Younger? He reckons up several Authors that pretend to it, *Democritus*, *Simonides*, and the *Lacedaemonians*; and decides in favour of *Democritus*, for a very good reason; because otherwise it would be of no use to him in the present Debate. But I am so far from yielding it up to *Democritus*, that I say *Democritus* lays no claim to it. *Plutarch* say, λόγος ἔργου σκεῖν Δημόκριτον; perhaps he had met with this in some Passage in *Democritus's* Works: but it will not follow from hence, that *Democritus* was the Author of it. Many *Proverbial Gnome*, in all Languages, are to be met with in the Dr's Dissertation; but No body will allow this Way of Arguing from 'em: Either these *Gnome* are Dr Bentley's own, or else he is a Sorry Plagiary. *Laertius*, the other Witness produc'd for *Democritus*, is as far from making *Democritus* the Author of this Sentence, as *Plutarch* is. In his Life of *Democritus* we find, Τάτα δὲ καὶ τὸ, Ἄγχι ἔργου σκεῖν. But in another place he tells us (a), *Solon* us'd to say, λόγον ἐδωλον εἶναι ἔργον: So that *Democritus*, according to *Laertius's* account, and Dr Bentley's Reasoning, must still have filch'd this Saying. And from the Variety of Opinions concerning the Original of it, I have more reason to suppose it older than *Phalaris*,

(a) Life of  
*Solon*.



ris, than Dr Bentley has to presume it Later. Here are Four Authors that have an Equal Pretence to it ; and if it be given to any of the Four, except *Democritus*, *Phalaris* might have us'd it after 'em : but I rather think that none of 'em have any Title to it. It is not an Observation of so deep a Reach, but that it might have been hit upon a hundred times, by Men no wiser than Dr Bentley, or my self, before the Pens of *Phalaris* or *Democritus* made it famous.

Dr Bentley goes on detecting *Phalaris's* Thefts ; but for Ornaments sake, the Phrase is varied. He finds him in the next Paragraph, *filching a Moral Sentence* \* ; in the Last, \* Dissert. it was a *Sentence of Moral* : which is the Only P. 35.

Change of Style, that I have observ'd in Dr Bentley's Dissertation for the better ; and therefore I ought to give him the Praise of it. The Moral Sentence is this, *Θνντὲς γὰρ ὄντας ἀθάνατον ὀρῶν ἔχον, ὡς παρὶ τίνας ἢ παρὶ ἑκά :* which is stolen, he says, from an Iambic Verse cited in *Aristotle's Rhetorick*, *Ἀθάνατον ὀρῶν μὴ φύλαττε θνντὲς ὦν.* But why might not this Iambic Verse be as well stolen from *Phalaris* ? or why might not both the Poet and the Prince be equally beholden to a Moral Sentence more ancient than either of them ? Were there no Moral Sentences before the Days of *Phalaris* ? Or, supposing the Letter-writer had this Iambic Verse in his Eye, how does it appear, that this Verse was not Older than *Phalaris* ? *Aristotle*, who cites it without a Name, leaves us in the dark, as to the Time of it. And how will the Dr's Conjecturing Faculty help him out here ? will he pretend by the  
Thread

(a) Diff. P. 35. Thread and Colour of its Style to judge to what Century it belongs? Ay, but it is a *Proverbial Gnome*, he says, and therefore *PROBABLY* borrow'd from the Stage; and *CONSEQUENTLY* must be later than *Phalaris*, let it belong to what Poet You please, *Tragic* or *Comic* (a). Why more probably borrow'd from the Stage, than from *Archilochus's* *Iambicks*? the Fragments of which are full of those Wise Sayings, which Dr Bentley calls *Proverbial Gnomæ*; and which do not, I think, look a whit the Wiser, for having that Hard Name given 'em. But should I grant him his *Probably*, yet his *Consequently* I can never allow; because I am very well satisfied, that there were both *Tragic* and *Comic* Poets before the Days of *Phalaris*. I shall talk with the Dr about the Age of *Tragedy* in another Article; here I shall consider *Comedy* only. The *Chronicon Marmoreum* informs us, that it was brought

\*ΑΦΟΤ ΕΝ ΑΘΗΝΑΙΣ  
ΚΟΜΩΔΙΑ ΠΡΩΤΟΝ Ε-  
ΤΕΘΗ ΕΝ ΣΑΝΙΣΙ, &c.  
Ep. 40. ἐς οὐρανὸν i. e. in  
Scenâ Tabulatâ.

into *Athens* by *Susarion*; or rather, that a \* *Stage* for the acting of *Comedies* was by him first erected in *Athens*: the Date is indeed worn out of the Marble; but it must

(b) Differ. P. 41. be before the Tyranny of *Pisistratus*, with which the next Epoch begins: and the Tyranny of *Pisistratus* Dr Bentley owns (b) to have been something before that of *Phalaris*. Those Learned Men, who have taken pains to illustrate this Chronicle, have by the Concurrence of Other Histories plainly shown, that the time of *Susario* must fall between the 610th and 589th Year before Christ. Take fairly the Middle of this account; and it falls out

out before the Reign of *Phalaris*. Mr *Selden* indeed, and some others, would have *Susario* the same with *Sannyrio*, which would bring him down to *Aristophanes*'s time; but the Excellent Bishop *Pearson*, in his *Vindicia Ignatiana* (a), has prov'd beyond all Controversie, (a) P. 2, that *Susario* is a distinct Poet from *Sannyrio*, 10, 11. and older by above 140 Years. But Comedy was yet Older than *Susario* himself; for it was Older than the Word by which it was call'd in *Susario*'s time, and had the same Common Name with Tragedy, long before the Division of Dramatic Poetry into those Two distinct Branches was form'd; as I shall prove from *Athenaus*, and Others, hereafter, in my Enquiry into the Origin of Tragedy. *Susario* was only the Improver of Comedy, as I shall shew *Thespis* to have been of Tragedy: He polish'd it first perhaps, and gave it something of a Regular Cast; which was handle enough for *Diomedes Grammaticus* (b). the Scholiast on (b) L. 3. *Aristophanes* (c), and *Clemens Alexandrinus* (d), (c) In Prolegom. (d) Strom. L. 1. to attribute the Invention of it to him. But that he was not the Inventor of it, the Marble it self does more than intimate; when it says only of him, that he first erected a Stage in *Athens*, to act Comedies upon. Indeed the Cities were beholden to the Villages for the Use of both Tragedy and Comedy; as we learn from *Aristotle* (e): In the Coun- (e) Poet. L. 1. try they began, and continu'd some time rude and unform'd, till the City took 'em out of the Peasants hands, and polish'd 'em. Allowing then Dr *Bentley* all his unreasonable Demands: that *Phalaris* had a regard to the Iambick Verse cited by *Aristotle*, and that

That

That Verse belong'd to the Stage? yet we see, it might belong to the Stage, and be more ancient than *Phalaris*.

Our *Critic* himself seems but ill satisfied with this Proof, (a Thing which rarely happens to him!) and therefore casts about for Another; and will find this Saying somewhere else. I see the Charge of Theft begins to clear up; we shall easily Quash an Indictment, that is thus laid in Two Places. Well! but who is this Second Author, that *Phalaris* has purloin'd? why, *Euripides*, in his *Philoctetes*. And, says Dr Bentley\*, from *Aristophanes* the famous *Grammatician* (who (after *Aristotle*, *Callimachus*, and Others) writ the *δδασκαλίαι*, a *Work* (were it now extant) most useful to *Ancient History*) we know, that this very *Fable Philoctetes* was written Olymp. 87; which is CXX Years after the Tyrant's destruction. Was ever *Scholiast* urg'd to clear a more Knotty Point? or urg'd more Knottily? He might as well from the *Chronicon Marmoreum*, compar'd with *Langbain's Fasti* have undertaken to prove, that *Thespis* was before *Dryden*. *Euripides's* his Words are,

Ὡςπερ ὃ θνητὸν καὶ τὸ σῶμα ἡμεῖς ἔχου,  
 οὕτω παροῖκαί μινδὲ τὰς ὀργὰς ἔχειν  
 Ἀδύνατον

Now (says the Dr) to him that compares these with the Words of the Epistle, 'twill be EVIDENT, that the Author had this very Passage before his Pen: there is ἔχειν and παροῖκα; not only a Sameness of Sense, but even of Words, and those not necessary to the Sentence: which could not fall out by Accident. All that is Evident

dent, I think is, that there is a *Sameness of Reasoning* runs throughout the Dr's whole Dissertation: let *Phalaris* shift for himself; I am resoly'd not to answer this Argument. Instead on't, I shall be bold to make an Objection to the Dr, which I desire him to answer; and that is, whether it were proper and prudent in him, to accuse *Phalaris* of a Theft, by a Pair of Quotations pillag'd from my poor Notes on this Epistle? and whether, among his other *Proverbial Gnomæ*, he should not have consider'd That about the *Old Woman in the Oven*?

Hitherto *Phalaris* has stolen discreetly, and borrow'd Expressions proper for him to use; but now, it seems, he steals without Decency or Distinction, out of *Callimachus*, and *Pindar*. For we find Two Words close together in Him, that are found as near one another in each of those Authors. *Phalaris* has ἐρίψαι δαίμονι. *Pindar* has δαίμονι ἐρίψαι, and *Callimachus* ἐρίψαι δαίμονι: the Dr is in a *Quandary* here to determine, which of these *Phalaris* made bold with; *Pindar* he should be inclin'd to guess, but that he is more inclin'd to guess 'tis *Callimachus*. Indeed *Callimachus*, *Dorizing* in this point, is One Letter farther off from him than *Pindar*: but then agen in Another place, which has nothing to do with This place, *Callimachus* has Two Other Words exactly the same. So that between *Pindar* and *Callimachus*, and *Callimachus* and *Pindar*, the Dr is, as I observ'd, in a Great *Quandary*. To relieve him in this Streight, I take leave to give him my Opinion, that *Phalaris* might  
rob

rob neither : for I can see nothing so Extraordinary in these Words, but that a much less Man than *Phalaris* might have hit upon 'em. The Dr fancies, he sees a *Quaintness* something Poetical in the Expression ; a Man, that dealt less Tenderly with Him than I, would be apt to fanſie, he saw a *Quaintness* something Pedantical in the Observation. Which of the Words is Poetical, ἔτερος or δαίμων ? ἔτερος

has no other Sense here †, than it has wherever 'tis us'd in any Prose Author : for the Dr may refine upon it, as he pleases; it signifies here neither more nor less than *Ano-*

† *Phalaris's* Words are,  
 ὡν εὐτυχόντων ἥν αὐτὸς  
 ἔτερον συμπλακὼ δαίμονι,  
 ἦδ' αἰς ἑδ' ἐν ἥπῳ εὐτυχῆν  
 δόξω Ep. 12.

ther ; tho' being oppos'd to εὐτυχόντων, this Other Fortune must, by construction, be understood to mean *Ill* Fortune. Is δαίμων then Poetical ? 'tis taken here for τύχη ; in what Author almost is it not taken so ? I could be very Learned here in my Citations; and, if I follow'd Great Examples, 'twould be a proper occasion, for there's no Need of 'em : I will only in the Margin point out to the Dr a Place or two from *Dionysius Halicarnas-*

(a) τῇ μὲν *sens* (a), and *Æschines*; and put him in mind of those words of *Eustathius*, Τῶν μέσων δὲ καὶ ὁ καὶ φέρειν τὸ δαίμων, καὶ ἡ τύχη, καὶ ἀμφότεροι εἰχυσαν αἱ λέξεις πρὸς αὐτῆς εὐνοίαν ἀγαθὴν καὶ μὴ τοιαύτην, &c.

δαίμονα

πλεῖν p. 172. — τῇ αὐτῆς καὶ καὶ δαίμονα κατοδυσμένῃ. p. 180.

— Τὸν δαίμονα, καὶ πρὸς τὴν τύχην πρὸς συμφορὰν ἀκολούθησεν τῇ ἀνδραγαθῇ φυλάσσας. In *Ctesiph.* p. 94. Ed. Ox.

*Tully*, in his Third *Philippic*, has these Two Expressions, *Fatum extremum Reipublicæ*, and *Magna Vis est, magnum Numen ipsum & idem* sen-

*sentientis Senatus. Fatum extremum*, and *Numen* here have, in my Judgment, something more of the Air of Poetry in 'em, than *τερον δέμων*; and accordingly we find the first of 'em once, and the Last often us'd in that Sense by *Virgil*. But I suppose Nobody will be so wild as to infer any thing from thence to the disadvantage of that *Philippic*. The same is to be said for the Words *ὄλεσιν ἔπος* in the 122d Epistle, which with great Sagacity he finds in *Callimachus*. The Latin of that Greek, *Invenere Tormentum*, is in *Ho. acc.* will he reject at Random any Prose writer, in whom I can find these Two Words together? if he will, I'll engage, at a venture, to find 'em. But till I know his Mind, I desire to be excus'd from the Trouble: for, begging the Dr's pardon, I take *Index-hunting* after Words and Phrases, to be, next *Anagrams* and *Acrostick*, the lowest Diversion a Man can betake himself to.

As trifling as these Two Criticisms are, yet Dr *Bentley* is so fond of 'em, that, to make 'em immortal, he has lately reprinted 'em, with his *Fragments of Callimachus*. 'Tis the only part of his Dissertation which, notwithstanding his Threatnings, he has yet thought fit to put into Latin; and, if I guess right, 'tis the only part that he ever will.

THE Last Sort of Proof the Dr has employ'd to shew the Epistles Younger than *Phalaris*, is the use of some Terms, or Words of Art, which were invented, he says, after *Phalaris*'s time: he instances in these Three, *Thericlean* (a) § III. *Cups* (a), *Philosophy* (b), and *Tragedy* (c). (b) § X. (c) § XI.

L

In

In the 70th Epistle, among other things with which *Phalaris* presents his Physician, mention is made of *Ten Couple of the Cups of Thericles*, whom our Critic thinks he can prove to be a *Corinthian Potter*, that liv'd an CXX Years after *Phalaris*. Before he proves it, I beg leave to interpose a Guess, about the true Reading of this Passage; which, if accepted, may save both Him and Us the trouble of his Learned Argument. The Text of *Phalaris*, as it stands now, is, καὶ Ποτηρίων Θηριλέων ζεύγη δέκα; what if it should heretofore have been Ποτηρίων θ' Ἡρακλείων &c? 'Tis a very inconsiderable Alteration, and yet it salves all: for that there was such a Cup, nam'd from *Hercules*, and therefore Old enough for *Phalaris* to use, *Athenians*, and *Tully* will inform us; the first of which, in his *Catalogue of Cups*, mentions the Ἡρακλειον as a di-

(a) P. 469. stinct sort, in one place (a), and

\* Vide *Casaub. Anim.*  
p. 782.

† Dicitur habere cum per-  
bona Toreumata; in his pocu-  
la duo quædam quæ *Heraclea*  
nominantur. *Act. 6. in Verr.*

πυλός in another \*: and the  
Latter reckons up Two *He-  
raclean Cups* † among the  
Wealth of *Verres*, which he  
had amass'd together out of  
*Sicily*, the very place where

the Scene of these Letters lay.

This small Alteration, which I take the Liberty to suggest, might easily creep into the Old MSS, that were in *Capitals*, without any distinction of Words: There the Original Reading might have been ΠΟΤΗΡΙΩΝ ΘΗΡΑΚΛΕΙΩΝ; and afterwards, by a slight Change of an A into an I, it might be corrupted into what it is Now by some Transcriber, whose Head was full of the *Thericlean Cup*; and who liv'd when the *Heracleon Cup* was disus'd and forgotten.

And



And this is not the Only Instance we have of One of these Names being mistaken for the Other; the *Archon* in the 61st *Olympiad*, whose

Name in *Dionysius Halicarnas-*

*sus* (a) is Ἡρακλῆς, in *Diodo-*

*rus* (b) is call'd Θηρακλῆς: and

such a Change, I hope, might

happen in these Epistles, as has

certainly happen'd in One of

those Authors. Nay, *Salma-*

*sus* (c) will not allow the Pre-

sent Reading of *Heraclea Pocu-*

*la*, in the Oration against *Ver-*

*res*; but, like a true Critic, without any Autho-

rity, substitutes *Thericlea*, in the room of it; and

says, it must be receiv'd as an *undoubted* altera-

tion: not remembring, I suppose, Then, that

*Athenaus* had said any thing of a Cup nam'd

from *Hercules*, tho' but Two Pages afterwards

he quotes the very Place in him where 'tis men-

tion'd. A Candid Reader then, that considers

what ado there is made about the Θηρακλῆς καλῆς

in Philologers, and how rarely the Ἡρακλεων is

mention'd, will perhaps think this Conjecture

of mine not *Improbable*, and grant me the be-

nefit of it. But Dr *Bentley*, I believe, will enter

his Protest: I remember a Saying of his, with

relation to a Word in *Tully*, which *Quintilian*

read otherwise than He would have had him:

But I, says he, would not believe

*Cicero* to have said so, tho' *Ci-*

*cero* himself should affirm it: and

despairing therefore to get this

Poor Guess of mine to pass with him, I must

e'en take the Term as I find it in *Phalaris*, and

see how far it affects our present Argument.

(a) Ἀρχοντὶ Ἀθηναίων  
Ἡρακλῆς, Ὀλυμπ. ἔα.  
p. 244.

(b) Ἀρχαῖος Ἀθήνασθι  
Ἡρακλῆς καὶ τῷ ἔα Ὀλυμπ.  
Excerpta. d. Diodoro, p. 241.

(c) Plin. Exerc. p. 735.  
Ita vulgò legitur, sed vix mi-  
hi dubium est, quin legendum  
sit Thericlea.

Ego verò Ciceronem ita  
scripsisse ne Ciceroni quidem  
ipso affirmanti crediderim. Ep.  
ad Mill. in fin. Malal. p. 80.

To fix the Age of *Thericles*, from whom these Cups are presum'd to have their Name, the Dr cites *Athenaw*; *One Witness* indeed, but as *GOOD* as a *Multitude*, he says, in a matter of this nature\* ; he might as well, I think, have said as *Many* : for why should *One Witness* be as Good as a *Multitude* in Cases of this Nature ? in Other Cases, I am sure, it is not : He may attaint *Phalaris* indeed upon a Single Evidence, but he can never in the common Course of Justice convict him ; and yet the Dr promis'd us to give him a *Fair and Impartial Tryal* †. If now there are several material Circumstances that disparage this *One Witness's* Testimony ; if he liv'd at a great distance from the Time he writes of ; if he speaks by Report and Hearsay only, without vouching any Authority ; if he expresses himself so, that we have room to doubt whether we know his mind ; or, should we know his mind, yet if he contradicts himself immediately afterward : I say, if these things appear against him, then this *One Witness* is so far from being as good as a *Multitude*, that he is as good as none. And I believe That will appear to be the Case, after I have examin'd him.

(a) Sape  
Athenaeum  
peccare  
graviter,  
dum suo-  
rum Excer-  
ptorum fi-  
dem sequi-  
tur, neq; ad  
fontes ipsos  
adit, multis  
locis probatum nobis satis superque. Anim. p. 377.

Had *Athenaus* given us an account of the *Author* of an Invention in his Own Time, or a little before him, we could easily have credited him upon his Word : but when he speaks of an Invention of 600 Years standing, and pretends nicely to fix the *Date* of it, without telling us from what *Author* he drew his Account, we may be allow'd to suspect his Exactness. His Mistakes, where he depends upon his *Memory*, or even upon his *Common-place-book* (a), without consulting the

very

very Authors themselves, are frequently taken notice of by his Learned Editor; and he could not mistake in a point that less deserv'd to be remember'd than this. Had he known, himself, from what Author he drew this account, he would without fail have told us; for he treads not a single step without an Authority, if he can have one: and we may therefore conclude, that he had none; and that the only reason, which determin'd him to fix the Age of *Thericles* about *Aristophanes's* time was, that he had not set down in his *Adversaria*, nor did at present call to mind a mention of the *Thericlean Cup* in any Writer more ancient than He. For observable it is, that among the Several Quotations in which he abounds on this head there is none that runs higher than the Age of that Poet. One there is, and but One, brought from a Lost Play of his, *Philonides*, where the *Thericlean Cup* is mention'd at large; but not a word said, by which we can make any Guess at the Age of *Thericles*. Our Critic indeed is of opinion, that in all probability *Athenæus* had this Indication [about the Age of *Thericles*] from some Play of *Aristophanes* now Lost, where that *Corinthian* was mention'd as one then alive (a). But in (4) Differ. all probability, *Athenæus* had not this Indication. P. 19. on from any such passage; because Then, in all Probability, he would have been so Communicative as to have let his Readers have it too. Had *Aristophanes* nam'd *Thericles* as *Living*, in any of his Plays, and had this been *Athenæus's* reason for making 'em Cotemporary, is it credible, that among so many other Passages he produces, relating to *Thericles*, he would have omitted This, that was worth all the rest, and

settled that very point of Chronology past dispute, which he was then laying down? especially, since he had not overloaded us on this Head, with *Aristophanes's* Verses; having cited him but *Once*; whereas *Alexis*, a Writer of much less Character, is produc'd four times to it, within the compass of twenty Citations? Could he be so Lavish, where there was no need of it? and so sparing where the very Strefs of the Point lay? I have no great Opinion either of *Athenaus's* Judgment or Exactness, (and when I say so, I speak but the

(2) Ejus Ego quidem Diligentiam in nonnullis, Judicium in multis requiro.

Animadv. p. 375.

Words of *Casaubon* (a); however, I cannot think him Injudicious and Careless to such a Degree as this: and therefore

I conclude, that he brought no Quotation of this kind out of *Aristophanes*, because he had none to bring.

Indeed, as he quotes No-body for this account of the Age of *Thericles*, so he speaks of it himself with distrust. Dr Bentley, 'tis true, in his Translation, has put him into the *Positive* Style; and made him roundly affirm, that the Cup WAS invented by *Thericles*, a Corinthian Potter, in *Aristophanes's* time: but *Athenaus* expresses himself with greater Reserve. His

\* καὶ τακενὺν (καὶ δὲ λέγει)  
τὴν κύλικα ταύτην Ὀπρι-  
κλῆς ὁ Κορινθίος κεραμεύς,  
γεγονὼς τοῖς χρόνοις κατὰ  
τὸ Ἀριστοφάνειον. P. 470.

Words are \*, *One Thericles*, a Corinthian Potter [who liv'd about the Time of *Aristophanes* the Comedian] IS SAID, or IS REPORTED to have made this

Sort of Cup: and FAMA EST à Corinthio Figulo *Thericle* factos, says the *Honest Latin* Translator. Which manner of speaking is the more to be observ'd, because it appears from several

ral

ral Passages in him, before and after this, that He himself was not satisfied of the Truth of this Report: for he immediately gives us some other accounts of the Original of the Word \*, \* P. 471. without the least Intimation which he prefers. I allow, that these Derivations are forced ones, and to be given up: for that the Name of the Cup came from the Name of a Man, is not to be doubted, I think; at least, it was not to be doubted, till Dr Bentley attempted to prove it. Let us step out of our way so far as to hear his Extraordinary Argument. Does not Common Analogy shew, says he, that as from *Ἡρακλῆς* comes *Ἡράκλειος*, and as from *Σοφοκλῆς* comes *Σοφocλειος*; so from *Θηρίκλῆς* (not only may, but) MUST come *Θηρίκλειος*? †? † P. 11. Wonderful! Who would have thought that such Certain Conclusions could be built on the Rules of Analogy? or that there was so near an Affinity between Logic and Grammar? Let us try it in another Instance: as from *Ἀπαλλῆς* comes *Ἀπάλλειος*, so from *Θαλλῆς* the Philosopher must come *θάλλειος* *Virens*: Here is the same Analogy, and yet the Inference from it is stark naught. The Dr then was too rash in asserting, that *Θηρίκλειος* must come from *Θηρίκλῆς*, by the Rule of Analogy: it does come from it, I grant; but does and must are very different Things. The English Rhime goes a Truer and Surer way to work;

As from Goose comes Goslin,  
So from Sir Posf. comes Sir Poslin.

L 4

But

But to return to our Serious and Weighty Point; *Athenaus*, I say, proposes some other Derivations of *Θηρίκλειος* besides that from *Θηρίαιες*; and tho' Dr *Bentley* and I are pretty well agreed, that they are frivolous ones, yet it does not appear any way, that *He* undervalu'd 'em; or determin'd which had the better claim to *Θηρίκλειος*, They, or *Thericles*, which is a Sign, I think that *He* himself was not fully satisfied in the matter. And another Shrewd Sign it is, that but a few Lines before this famous Passage, he cites a Fragment from a Play of *Alexis*, where, as he in-

(a) Καὶ μήποτε Ἀλέξιος  
(says he) *Θηρίκλειον* περὶ τὸν  
Ἡρόκλεια πίνοντα; and does  
not *Alexis* introduce *Hercu-*  
*les* drinking out of a *Thericlean Cup*? In the Passage from *Alexis*, as it now stands in *Athenaus*, *Thericles* is not mention'd: but 'tis plain *Athenaus* thought, from some Expressions in it, that this Cup might be intended; or else he would not have ask'd a Question about it.

interprets it (a), *Hercules* is brought in, drinking out of a *Thericlean Cup*: and this he does without taxing the Absurdity of the Poet; which he could hardly have omitted to do, if he had believ'd the Invention no Older than *Aristophanes*: for, at this rate, the bringing *Hercules*, and a *Thericlean Cup* upon the Stage together, would have been as ridiculous, as if one of Our

Dramatic Poets should represent *William the Conqueror* drinking in *Dwights Ware*. *Alexis*, one would think, could not have committed such an Absurdity, who liv'd but Threescore Years after *Aristophanes*; at least *Athenaus* could not have pass'd it by uncensur'd, if that Report about the Age of the *Thericlean Cup* had stuck with him.

But

leave the Merits of the Cause to be decided by clearer Testimonies.

And now what becomes of the Pompous Character with which Dr *Bentley* introduces this Single Evidence? *One indeed, but as good as a Multitude!* I agree with the Dr, if he means a Multitude of such Suborn'd Witnesses as he has brought to blast the Credit of *Phalaris*; One good Honest Downright Witness were worth 'em all: but Such, I think, I have prov'd *Athenaus* not to be in the Present Debate. However, if after what has been offer'd, the Reader should still be inclin'd to believe this one Hearsay Witness, I desire him to remember, that his Evidence lies within a Narrow Compass, and that he affects but One Epistle: So that should That, where the *Thericlean Cup* is mention'd, prove Spurious, yet the other 147 may, to our Comfort, be Genuine still. And this Consideration I hope the Reader has carried along with him thro' all the *Particular Proofs*, that they touch only those Particular Epistles from whence they are taken, but do not affect the whole Body of 'em; for a Passage, or Part of a Book may be Spurious, and yet the Book it self not be Spurious: especially when it is a Collection of Pieces, that have no Dependance upon one another, as *Epistles, Epigrams, Fables*; the first Number of which may have been encreas'd by the Wantonness, or Vanity of Imitators in after-times, and yet the Book be Authentic in the main, and an Original still.

There

There are some Other Important Controversies which Dr Bentley has occasionally handled in this Paragraph ; as whether *Thericles* was a *Turner*, or a *Potter* \*?

\*Dis. p. 18. *This great Point was started, solemnly argu'd, and determin'd by Salmasius, in his Exercitations ; and from thence Dr B. has taken every word he has said upon it: sho' at the same time he says it in such a manner as if no body had said it before him.*

† Ibid. p. 20.

whether *Bulls* and *Cows* may be properly call'd *ſūpes*, as well as *Lyons* and *Tygers* †? But these things making neither for, nor against our Argument, I am not at leisure to dispute 'em with him. The Misfortune of it is, that the Great Variety of Reading

which the Dr has produc'd on a very Trifling Head, may perhaps mischief him in the opinion of an Intelligent Reader ; and make him thought a Man, who, with Ill Judgment, employs most of his Time on those things that deserve it least. To take off those suspicions, and to do his Character right, I assure the Reader, that he went no further for almost all the Learning he displays on this Article than his Dictionaries, and what One of those (a) refer'd him to, *Casaubon's* Notes on *Athenæus*. However, since he was so much oblig'd to that Great Man, I wonder that Common Gratitude, and Common Sense should not hinder him from falling upon Him, as he does, at the very time he is transcribing him. *Casaubon*, in a Passage of *Athenæus* relating to this Controversie, was willing to read *αἰνῶντα*, instead of *αἰνδῶντα* ; and gave his Reason for it, that he found it so in the ancient Epitomizer of *Athenæus*: to which our Differtator, with an Air of Superiority, replys, *One may be CER-*

(a) *Hesych.*  
in voce  
*Ἐν γλῶσῃ*  
es, and the  
Notes upon it.

TAIN

TAIN 'twas a fault ONLY in that Copy of him that Casaubon us'd: for Eustathius, WHO APPEARS NEVER to have seen the true Athenæus, but only that Epitome, read it in his Book *ωὐδὲν ἄλλο*. &c. \*. Which is said with an Equal Degree of Truth, Decency, and Reason. For, in the first place, it is certain that Eustathius had seen, and does sometimes quote Athenæus himself, tho' he generally goes no further than the Epitome of him: and therefore Casaubon says only of Eustathius, that he did (a)

OFTEN use the Epitome, without consulting Athenæus himself; and that he did NOT SELDOM

make use of the Reading, which was in the Excerpta, neglecting that in the Text, which was Truer and Better: And I'll tell the Reader One Reason among an

hundred, why he should sooner in this case trust Casaubon than Dr Bentley; 'tis, that Casaubon had the Excerpta of Athenæus entire, and could compare 'em therefore with Athenæus himself, and with Eustathius: whereas Dr Bentley will not pretend, I suppose, ever to have seen the Excerpta; for they are unprinted (b) to this day: and when therefore he pronounces it to be apparent, that Eustathius never saw the

true Athenæus, he talks of a thing that he knows nothing of, and can in all probability know nothing of, but from Casaubon; and yet ventures to contradict him. Had I not reason to make the Itch of opposing Great Names upon very slight or no Grounds, a Chief and Distinguishing Mark of Pedantry?

But

(a) SÆPE uti Epitome integro Athenæi Codice neglecto -- NON RARO sequi lectionem quæ in Excerptis, præter ea quæ in Contextu longè interdum melior ac verior. *Animad.* p. 2.

(b) All, but so much of 'em as supplies the Room of what we have lost of Athenæus himself.



But what if *Eustathius* had seen only the Epitome of *Athenæus*? and His Copy of the Epitome had differ'd from *Casanbon's*? does it follow, that all the Rest did so too? This is our Critic's admirable Inference; because in *Eustathius's* Copy 'twas *αὐτὸς οὐτα*, and not *αὐτὸς οὐτα*, therefore one may be certain it was so in all the Copies, but that which *Casanbon* us'd. I can easily bear his Contempt of Me and my Knowledge, when I find him opposing one of the Greatest Men that ever the Commonwealth of Learning produc'd, without so much as the Shadow of an argument to back him in it.

† At the  
End of  
Malala.

The Reader, I hope, will pardon me, if I wander a moment or two from my Subject, to give him a Like Instance of the Unreasonable Freedom Dr *Bentley* takes in reprehending Learned Men, even where there is no manner of Ground for it. In his Epistle to Dr *Mill* †, upon mentioning an *Anapaestic* Verse of *Grotius*, [*Prisca domos dedit Indigena*] he takes occasion to reprove Him, and with Him, *Joseph Scaliger*, and All the Moderns, that have written in this sort of Verse, for not knowing the True Measure of it; which, he says, will never admit of a *Trochee*, or a *Tribrach* in the End of it, but when there is some kind of Stop and Rest there: and for this reason *Seneca* the Tragedian, he assures us, has not imploy'd a *Trochee* in that place above once or twice throughout all his Plays, and then only when there was a Full Close of the Sense: and concludes, that if *Scaliger*, *Grotius*, and the rest had liv'd in *Athens*, or Old *Rome*, and taken this Liberty in their Plays, they

they would have been his'd off the Stage with Infamy for it (a). One would think that Dr

Bentley, with all his Stock of Self sufficiency could not have allow'd himself to use such insulting Language towards such Eminent Men, but when he was perfectly sure of his point: and yet nothing can be falser and fuller of mistake than what he has here asserted. It is Usual among the Greek Tragœdians to end their Anapaestic Verses with a Trochee or a Tribrach, even where there is *No Pause*; of which I will give him several Instances out of One Play of *Æschylus* (b): and *Seneca* is so far from having done this not above *once or twice*, and where there was a *full Close* of the Sense, that I believe he has done it at least forty or fifty times, where there is either no Close at all, or none beyond a Comma. I shall give the Dr as many Instances out of *Seneca* \*, as I have done

(a) *Tribrachys* est Loco *Anapaesti*; quod vitium commune est *Grotio* cum *Jos. Scaligero*, *Flor. Christiano*, *Alisiq;* opinor Omnibus qui *Sæculo* hoc & superiore vel *Tragœdias Græcas* Latine vertunt, vel ipsi scripserunt novæ: quibus solenne est *Anapaestos* suos passim, ubi nulla Clausula est, nec interpunctum, *Tribrachi*, vel *Trochæo*, vel *Cretico* terminare. Næ isti, si olim stante *Re Græcâ* vel *Romanâ* suas *Fabulas* edidissent, *Sibilis* & *καὶ ὡς μέγ* è *Scenâ* explosi fuissent p. 26. Quin & *Seneca* *Tragicus*, ut scias eum de *Industria temperavisse*, *semel tantum atque iterum Trochæo Anapaestis* clausit, *nec nisi finitâ sententiâ*: qui scilicet *Paræmiaco* Locus esset, nisi is *Scriptor*, nescio cur, *versum illum* reputâisset. *Ibid.*

(b) . . . . . ὁπείτοι  
Τὴν Διὸς αὐλὴν εἰσιτοχρεῖται Πρ. Δ.  
Διὰ τ' ἰσὺν φιλότιμα βροτῶν. V. 122.  
Νῦν δ' αἰθέριον κίνυγμα ὁ τάλας  
Ἐχθροῖς ἐπ' ἡχάρτα πέπειθα. V. 156.  
Εἰς ἀρθμόν ἐμοὶ καὶ φιλότιμα  
Σπύδων. V. 191.  
Τὸν δὲ χαλινῶς ἐν πτερίνοισι  
Κεμαζόμενον. V. 565.  
— ἑρῶμβοι δὲ κόνιν  
Εἰλίπυσαν. V. 1084.

\* *Trucibus monstris stetit imposita*  
*Pelion Ossa* — *Agam. V. 337.*  
— *Spargeret astra*  
*Nubemq; ipsas.* *Med. V. 334.*  
*Nos Cadmeis Orgia ferre*  
*Tecum solitæ.* *Oet. V. 594.*  
*Nec Parrhasia lentior arce*  
*Sxvâ cessit* — *Oet. V. 1282.*  
— *Nunc Corybantes*  
*Arma Ideâ quassata manu.*  
*Oet. V. 1877.*

done out of *Æschylus*; and then ask him, how he durst oppose men of *Grotius* and *Scaliger's* Character, with such groundless Assertions, as it was in every-body's power to disprove, that did but cast their Eye on *Seneca*, and the Greek Tragœdians?

But to return to our business — I have now examin'd, I think, all that is material in Dr Bentley's Objection about the *Thericlean Cups*, as far as the Authority of the Letters is concern'd in it: his Exception against My way of *Translating* the Word shall not be forgotten in its proper place; when I come to consider the Faults he has found with my Edition and Version.

This has, I confess, been a Long Article, but the next will make us amends; for I can hardly perswade my self to say any thing to it. He finds fault with the Letters for making *Phalaris*, in his Address to *Pythagoras*, call his Doctrine *Philosophy*; and Him, in another place, *Philosopher* \*: why? because *Pythagoras* himself invented these Words \*. Could *Phalaris* therefore pay him a greater Compliment, than by using 'em? Queen *Elizabeth* first coin'd the Word *Fæminilis* in a Speech of Hers, as I remember, to One of the Universities; could that Body have shew'd her an handsomer piece of Respect, than by using that very Word to Her afterwards as freely, as if it had been of the best Age of Latin? *Pythagoras* affected to be call'd *Philosopher*, and fram'd the Term to that very End and Purpose: Would Dr Bentley have had *Phalaris*, when he design'd him

\* Dissert.  
p. 38.

him an Honour, rob him of the Title he was most fond of? He knew better how to Please the Man he was to Profit by: as little Good Nature as he had left, yet he had some Civility, and a great deal of Sense; and, by the help of these, escap'd that Absurd Management, which Dr Bentley, I find, had he been advis'd with, would have put him upon.

But how came the Fame of so small a Business [as Pythagoras's assuming this Name] to reach Phalaris's Ear? He may as well ask, how he came to hear his Name was Pythagoras? Fame, that told him the One, must tell him the Other too, after once Pythagoras had set up his Pretensions: and I desire Dr Bentley to prove that our Letter-writer nam'd him so before: and till he does That, the Epistles are safe from any Harm that This small Objection can do 'em.

Before I go further, I must observe to the Reader an Instance of Dr Bentley's great Goodness, which deserves to be taken notice of: *I could shew* (says he) *from a whole Crowd of Authors, that Pythagoras first invented the word: but I content my self with Two.* To content himself with Two Quotations, when he could produce so Many; and that upon so Clear and Manifest a point, that he need not have produc'd Any, (in which Cases He is usually most Liberal of his Learning) is no Common Favour; and I ought therefore (as I do) thankfully to own it. It almost tempts me to drop a Question or two that I had to ask him here; as what he means by saying,

M

that

that Pythagoras first nam'd Philosophy? whether. that he first nam'd That Philosophy, which before was call'd Wisdom? and why,

(a) φιλοσοφία ἡ πρώτη ἀνθρώπων Πυθαγόρας, says Laertius, whom he translates; but it follows presently, θάττον δὲ ἐκαλεῖτο Σοφία: which makes the Expression not so improper in Laertius's Greek, as Dr Bentley's English.

(b) Dissert. p. 39.

if he meant so, he did not say so (a)? And what again he would be at, when he tells us, that Pythagoras invented the word first? and who it was that Invented it Last? Something too I had to say to him about Nurses talking Philosophy (b): But he has

been very merciful in this Paragraph; and I forgive in my Turn.

There is still behind One Exception to the Credit of the Epistles, taken from the Names of some Tragædians, there, and no where else to be found; and from the Age and Date of Tragædy it self. The Section in which this Argument is manag'd is a short one, but very fruitful in Mistakes, and those of the First Rate; for which reason, and because it is the Last trouble of the kind I am likely to give the Reader, I shall insist upon it somewhat largely.

*Aristolochus* and *Lysinus*, he says are Two \* P. 39. *Tragic Poets* that No-body ever heard of \*; and in another place, with great Humor, he calls † P. 120. 'em Two *Fairy Tragædians* †: tho' methinks One of 'em at least seems not to be of the Race of those Little Beings; one would guess *Aristolochus*, by his Name, to be rather a *Gyant* than a *Fairy*. But to let that pass,—  
Is

Is he sure, that Neither of these Poets can be trac'd in Old Writers? what does he think of the *Numerus Aristolochius* (a) in the Nameless Piece usually printed with *Censorinus*? does it not come from *Aristolochus*, a Poet; as the *Numerus Aristophanius* in the same Chapter does from *Aristophanes*? But because the MSS differ in this passage, I will not insist upon it. I will allow him, for the present, that No-body ever heard of either of these Tragædians but in *Phalaris*; and I will give him a good reason for it: neither their Works, nor their Names were worth preserving. *Phalaris* has drawn their Characters in short; the One of 'em he calls a very foolish Fellow (b), and the other a Sorry Poet, and an Impotent Adversary (c): and the Writings of such Men can never last; nor even their Names, but by the Help of better Writers: and by the way therefore I would advise Dr Bentley not to be too Vain upon his Performances. *Barinus* and *Mævius* had a Scornful Verse bestow'd upon 'em by *Virgil*; and That it self would have made 'em Scandalously well known to Posterity, tho' No one else should ever have nam'd 'em. If Sir *William Temple* should make such a Slighting Mention of Dr Bentley in any of his Future Writings, He too will Live

(a) In the Text, as it stands printed now, 'tis Archebolution: upon which Ludovicus Carrius has this Note, Vulgò Aristolochium, Membrane Aristodolium: so that some Editions (from some MSS, I suppose) have it Aristolochium; or if the Editors made this change without the authority of MSS, 'twas because they knew more of this Aristolochus than I own I do.

(b) Ἀμαδίστατος Ἀντίπας.

Ep. 97.

(c) Καὶς μὲν πικρὸς, ἀναλκὺς ὅλως.

Ep. 68.

† Dissert.  
p. 118.

by that means, and not otherwise. Will the Dr expunge out of the Catalogue of Mankind, (as his Terrible Words are †) all Poets that have the Ill Luck to be mention'd but *Once* in Old Authors? I thought, as a Critic, and a Philologer, he would have had more Regard for an *ὦ πότμος ἀνθρώπων*. What, at this rate, will become of Poor *Xenocles* and *Pythangelus*? (Two Tragædians, just of the same size with our Two Fairy ones) whom *Aristophanes* once mention'd with contempt, as *Phalaris* does These; and Whom (at least the First of 'em) Dr Bentley will be hard put to't to find mention'd by any-body besides him. But not having consider'd This Piece of History sufficiently, I will not be positive in it: there is Another, in which I have somewhat better Grounds to go upon; 'tis the instance of *Chlonthachonthlus*. He was no Poet indeed, but pretty near akin to one; a Lye-maker by Profession, and a famous Misrepresenter. Perhaps the Dr has never heard of him to this day; and perhaps he'll know as little of him two or three Years hence, as he does now: and yet I assure him, He s to be met with in a Celebrated Greek Author, in Whom he lies buried, and unknown to many of the Great Lights of the Commonwealth of Learning, because that Good Author has the Misfortune to be put out without a Good Index. Now I'll undertake to trace *Aristolochus*, or *Lyfinus*, as soon as Dr Bentley shall *Chlonthachonthlus*: and when he lights upon him, he'll find, that the Author, where he is, is confessedly Genuine, notwithstanding he men-

mentions this unheard of Monster of a Man, whom no-body ever mention'd since or before him.

But Dr Bentley has a better Objection than the Silence of Authors against these Tragædians; he says, they could not have a being in *Phalaris's* time, because there was then no such thing as *Tragædy* it self: *neither the Word nor Thing being known, while Phalaris tyranniz'd at Agrigentum. But Thespis was the first Inventor of it, who acted his first Tragædy twelve Years after the Death of Phalaris: and both the Name and the Thing were then (and not till then) born together* \*. In Opposition \* *Dissert.* to this, I shall endeavour to make out these *2. 90.* Three things: first, that granting *Thespis* to have been the Inventor of *Tragædy*, yet he found it out early enough for *Phalaris* to have the use of the Word from him: in the next place, that *Tragædy* was much Older than *Thespis*; and that He was only the Improver, but not the Inventor of it: and yet further, that the *Word* *Tragedy* was more ancient than the *Thing*, which we now understand by it. I think these Three Points to be clear beyond dispute: if the Reader, after I have produc'd my Proofs, thinks so too, he will, I suppose, have a less Opinion of Dr Bentley's Learning and Modesty than even he has already, and be something nearer toward thinking these Epistles Genuine.

Let us suppose for the present, that *Thespis* was the Inventor, (or as Dr Bentley Emphatically speaks) *the first Inventor of Tragædy*;



(b) *Vir.  
Solon.*  
(b) in *Solone.*

'tis plain, *Phalaris* might have the use of the word from him. That *Thespis* was Cotemporary with *Solon*, *Plutarch* (a), and *Diogenes Laertius* (b) expressly affirm; telling us very particularly what pass'd between *Solon* and *Thespis*, in relation to the Plays of the Latter. And this account of *Thespis*'s age Our Dissertator him-

(c) *Neque Thespis eâ quâ  
ventus tempestate vixit; nam  
Solonis aequalis fuit. P. 46.*

(d) *Sophocles*, quoted by  
*Diogenes Laertius* in *Solon*.  
*Eusebius*, in his *Chronicon*,  
puts it a Year later.

(e) *Dissert. p. 15.*

self, in his *Soft Epistle* to  
*Dr Mill* (c) allows. Now  
*Solon* was *Archon Olympiad*  
*XLVI. 3.* (d) *Phalaris* began  
his Reign *Ol. LIII. 3.*, and end-  
ed it *Ol. LVII. 3.*, according  
to the account which *Dr*  
*Bentley* (e) allows. So that  
between the Beginning of *So-*

*lon*'s and the End of *Phalaris*'s Government  
there are full 44 Years: Time enough in  
Conscience, for the Word *Tragædy* to come  
from *Athens* to *Agrigent*! And *Eusebius*'s *Chro-*  
*nicon* allows near as much Room for it, pla-  
cing the Rise of *Tragædy* at the 47th *Olym-*  
*piad*, a little after *Solon*'s Archonship. But  
to take our account at the very lowest; let us  
suppose that *Thespis*'s first Plays were those  
that *Solon* saw, towards the Latter End of his  
Life: *Solon* dy'd at the End of the *LIII*d, or  
the beginning of the *LIV*th *Olympiad*, accord-  
ing to the account which *Plutarch* espouses (f);  
that is, a Year or two after *Phalaris* took the  
Tyranny upon him. Take Two or Three  
Years before *Solon*'s death, when *Thespis* is  
suppos'd by this Low account first to have  
written; and from thence to the End of *Pha-*  
*laris*'s Reign, there is a space of about 17  
Years,

(f) *Vir.  
Solon.*

Years, for *Phalaris* to hear of *Thespis's* Tragedies : for it does not appear, but that those Letters, where the Word *τῆς τραγῳδίας* occurs, might have been written at the very End of his Tyranny. However, let 'em have been written in the middle, or at the very beginning of it, yet still there will be time enough for *Phalaris* to learn this new word in. That *Pisistratus* seiz'd the Government of *Athens* some Years before *Solon's* death, Dr *Bentley*, I dare say, will grant me : that he was turn'd out in, or rather before *Phalaris's* Reign, he will not, I hope, deny me ; because he has own'd it in Terms, p. 41, of his Dissertation. Allowing then that *Solon* and *Thespis* were Cotemporary, there can be no doubt, whether *Phalaris* might hear of *Thespis's* Tragedies.

All that can startle us in the case is the Authority of the *Arundel Marble*, which seems to fix the acting of *Alcestis*, one of *Thespis's* Plays, about the 60th Olympiad. But that all the *Ara's* of that Marble are not rightly adjusted, is certain. and Learned Men have prov'd beyond dispute : and if there be mistakes in it, why may not this be one of 'em ? when what is said there is contradicted by such an Universal Concurrence of almost all the History of those times, which we have left ? Dr *Bentley*, I am sure, ought not to insist on the Authority of the Marble in this case, because He himself has quitted it in an Instance of the like Nature. The *Arundelian Marble* indeed (says he) differs from all these in the periods of *Gelo* and *Hiero* ; which would

quite confound all this argumentation from Notes of Time. But either that Chronologer is quite out ; or we can safely believe nothing in History. Disf-  
fert. p. 85. The Mistake of the Marble may be in putting *Thespis's* name instead of *Phrynichus* his Scholar : and *Alceftis*, the name of the Play, would make one think so, which *Suidas* exprefly mentions as one of *Phrynichus's* ; but is no where, that I can find, reckon'd among *Thespis's*. And fuch a Mistake might eafily, I fuppose, arife from the Negligence of the Graver, who, when he had gone as far as ἀπ' ἑοικέντος ὁ Ποντῆς, might throw his Eye upon a Lower Line, where there was an account of *Phrynichus's* Age ; and finding the Word Ποντῆς there exactly in the fame Situation, might think himfelf right, and go on with the reft that follow'd it : which is a Cafe that is known often to have happen'd in the Copying of MSS ; and may the rather be fuppos'd to have happen'd Here, becaufe the next *Ara* in the Marble falls as low as Olympiad 67 ; before which time it is not to be doubted but the *Alceftis* of *Phrynichus* (that *Phrynichus*, who was *Thespis's* Scholar) was acted.

But, without the help of this Conjecture, and without laying afide the Authority of the Marble ; what is faid there may poffibly be true, and yet *Plutarch's* and *Laertius's* accounts be true too, and the Epiftles Genuine. For fome of *Thespis's* Plays might be acted in *Solon's* time, that is, about the 53d Olympiad ; and yet his *Alceftis* be shown not till about the 60th : which being a Play writ-  
ten

ten after great Experience, and when he was in his Maturest Judgment, might be the Best of his Works, for ought I, or Dr Bentley, can tell, and That by which he carried the Prize from his Rivals; and the fittest therefore to be taken notice of to Posterity. The Dr indeed says, it was his *First*; and says it in such a manner, as if the Marble had said it before him: but that is only according to his Usual Way of putting History upon us. All the Inconvenience that arises from hence, is, that *Thespis* must then be supposed to have written Plays at the distance of at least Seven whole Olympiads: and what if he be? there was yet a greater distance between *Aristophanes's* First and his Last Play; even the Interval of Nine entire Olympiads, or 36 Years. And I believe, 'tis much about the same time, since Mr *Dryden* wrote his First Play; and the World has lately had a very convincing Instance, that he is not yet disabl'd. Should Dr Bentley pretend tis improbable, that if *Alceſtis* were *Thespis's* Best Play, it should not be mention'd by *Suidas*; my answer is, that I think it is as improbable, that *Suidas* should not mention it, if it were his *First*: and therefore I have told him my Opinion before, that it was neither his First, nor Last; but *Phrynichus's* Play erroneously apply'd to him by the Marble-Graver.

I have not mention'd *Suidas's* Testimony about the Age of *Thespis*, because I think it of no manner of Consequence; he being so often and so egregiously out in things of this nature, by the faultiness of the MSS we now have

have of him, or the Errors of those Authors which he at a venture transcribes. I confess, as he stands now, he seems to bring *Thespis* somewhat lower than even the *Marble* may be suppos'd to do; for he says, he flourish'd ἐν τῇ ᾠδῇ ὅλυντος &c. in the 61st Olympiad: but 'tis observable, that the Decads in this Number are not express'd by a Word, but a Numeral Letter, which is more liable to alteration; and as  $\Xi$  therefore might easily creep into the place of a N: the restoring of which would make his account

(a) Itaque, ut rectè monuit Meursius in Solone, graviter errat Suidas, qui in *Olymp.* 61. eum fabulas primum docuisse scribit. Menag. Comm. in Solon.

(b) P. 46.

consistent with better Authorities (a). However that may be, Dr Bentley must remember, that He himself has produc'd (b) this account in his Letter after *Malala*, as Consistent with *Plutarch's* Story, which makes *Thespis* contem-

porary with *Solon*; and is oblig'd therefore to reconcile the One with the Other, as much as I am: and he must remember too, that *Suidas* in the same place tells us, that *Thespis* was the Sixteenth Tragædian from *Epigenes Sicyonius*; and if he admits This part of his account, he'll lose as much by it, as he gains by the Other.

For whether *Thespis* was as ancient as *Solon* it matters not much, if *Tragædy* was yet more ancient than He: and that it was so, there are such Plain and Pregnant Testimonies as are not to be withstood. *Plato's* words on this occasion are very remarkable and full. *Tragædy*, says he, is of ancient Usage in this Country, nor did it take its Rise from *Thespis*  
and

and Phrynichus, as Some Imagine (it seems, for Dr Bentley's comfort, there were Men Ignorant enough, even in Plato's Time, to think so) but if You consider the thing well, You will find, that it is extremely ancient (a): and the Reason of his introducing this Reflection shews, that he thought it almost as ancient as Minos. I was aware of this Objection from the Date of Tragedy, when I put out *Phalaris*; and thought therefore that I had prevented it by a short Note on the 97th Epistle, where I refer'd the Reader to this Passage in Plato. Dr Bentley, who has made so free an use of many Hints in my Book, against *Phalaris*, should not in Justice have over-look'd this Note, which made so strongly for him: but I find he has the Secret of seeing nothing in an Author, but what serves to countenance his Own Opinions.

Plato's Testimony needs no Support with any man that justly esteems him; which for fear Dr Bentley should not, I will produce another Witness, whose Character and Works, I believe, are better known to him: It is *Dio- genes Laertius*; who in the Life of Plato has these Words, *ANTIEN- TLY* (says he) the Chorus did alone sustain the Tragedy; *AFTERWARDS* Thespis found out One *ἄλυσον*, (b) γὰρ πα- and gave the Chorus time to breathe (b): to whom λυσὸν ἐν τῇ Τραγῳδίᾳ ποίτητον μὲν μόνον ὁ χορὸς διεδραμάτιζεν, ὕστερον δὲ Θέσπις ἐν αὐτοῖς ἐξέσφεν, ὥστε ἀναπαύεσθαι τὸν χορὸν, &c.

(a) Ἡ δὲ Τραγῳδία οὖν παλαιὸν ἐνθάδε ἐκείνη εἰον, ἀπὸ Θέσπιδος ἀρ-αμένη, ἔσ' ἀπὸ Φρυνίχου: ἀλλ', εἰ θέλεις ἐννοῆσαι, πάνυ παλαιὸν αὐτὸ εὐρήσεις. &c.  
Plato in *Minos*.

*Æschy-*

*Æschylus*, he tells us, added a Second; and *Sophocles*, a Third. Sober Tragædy, according to his Opinion, was more ancient than *Thespis*; and He only an Improver of it.

\* In his  
Poetry.

*Laertius's* account falls in exactly with what *Aristotle* has said on the same Subject, as far as *Aristotle* goes; only it is more particular and full. *Aristotle* \*, reckoning up the Gradual Advances that had been made towards the perfection of Tragædy, after its first Establishment, tells us, just as *Laertius* does, that *Æschylus* improv'd it mightily, by bringing a Second Actor on the Stage; and that *Sophocles* perfected it by the addition of a Third. *Thespis's* Invention of a First Actor is here imply'd also, tho' it be not express'd: and indeed it was not to *Aristotle's* purpose to mention it, when he was considering the Improvements of Tragædy, as an Artificial Poem, which had a *Fable*, and an Action distinct from that of the Chorus; that is indeed, as it came out of the Hands of *Thespis*, who in this respect must be own'd to have been the Founder rather than the Improver of it. The not considering these Two different States and Conditions of Tragædy is what has bred great Confusion in the Writings of the Criticks, and led Dr Bentley into all his Numerous Errors in this point. If he will suffer himself to be taught by so inconsiderable a Writer as I am, I will endeavour to set him right, and to give him a clearer Account of it.

Tra-

Tragedy at first was nothing but an Hymn to the honour of *Bacchus*, sung by a Number of Peasants, after their Vintage was over, whilst the Goat lay bleeding upon the Altar. The Company that perform'd this Sacred Song, either alternately, or all together, as it happen'd, were what in Succeeding Times was call'd the *Chorus*; in which therefore it must be remember'd that the Foundation of Tragedy was laid. Afterwards the Subject of Tragedy was much alter'd and vary'd: for the Composers of those Songs together with the Praises of *Bacchus* join'd the Eulogiums of Great and Famous Persons, and Satyrical Reproofs † also of the Vicious Men, † Ibid. and Manners of their Times. But still All this was perform'd by the *Chorus*; and (as *Laertius* observes) continu'd so to be till *Thespis*'s time. He, to please the Audience, and relieve the *Chorus*, brought a single Actor upon the Stage; who, at fit Intervals, came out from the Rest, and imitated the Actions of some Illustrious Person, and retir'd agen, when the *Chorus* had taken breath; which was still the most Considerable Part of the Entertainment. However by this Invention a new Turn was given to Tragedy, the Business of the *Chorus* was lessen'd, and part of it brought into the hands of a single Actor, and something like a *Plot*, or *Fable* was introduc'd. *Aeschylus* improv'd upon this Model, and grew still more upon the *Chorus*, by adding a Second \* Actor, and diversifying the *Fable*; and *Sophocles* at last compleated the Poem, by the addition of a Third.

\* *Aeschylus* employ'd sometimes a Third Actor too, but rarely.



Third. And by this time the Chorus, which was at first Essential to Tragædy, and did all in it, was grown only an Accessory Ornament of it; and employ'd to relieve the Actors, in the same manner that the Actors were at first found out to relieve That. Nay, to see the fate of things, the Chorus, which was anciently the Play it self, now serv'd chiefly to represent the Spectators, and to suggest such Reflections as They, observing what pass'd upon the Stage, might be suppos'd to make.

Tragædy being now a thing so very different from what it was before, and *Thespis* having made the first Step towards this great Change, it is no Wonder that he should be call'd sometimes the Author of it; that is, the Author of that Sort of Tragædy, which consisted in Imitation, and a Fable, exclusive to the Necessity of a Chorus, and which had now, among the Men of Art, who spake nicely, and reason'd subtilly about things, almost engross'd the Name. I say, exclusive of the Necessity of a Chorus: for tho', in remembrance of the first Rise of Tragædy, and in compliance with the Ceremonies of Religion, the Chorus was still retain'd; yet it came in only by the bye as it were, and the Action, upon which the Play turn'd, was Entire and Perfect without it.

What was said of Tragædy then in the Second and more Confin'd Sense of the word, Dr Bentley in his great Wisdom and Learning took as said of it at large; and pronounc'd at a venture that there was no such Thing as Tragædy before *Thespis's* time, because there  
was

was no such thing as that Sort of Tragædy which *Thespis* invented: which is as if I should say, the *Italians* first found out *Opera's*, a Bastard Sort of Tragædy, in these Latter Days; and therefore the *Italians* first found out Tragædy. There is no difference in the case but this, that what the *Italians* did was a Debasement of Tragædy, whereas *Thespis's* Invention was an Improvement of it: but still Tragædy it self was equally before the Improvement of the One, and the Debasement of the other.

Our Critic was not contented to make but One Mistake on this Point; He has doubled it, by urging also a mistaken Authority for it: for those Verses of *Horace*, which He, out of the Depth of his Reading, produces on this occasion, are far from countenancing his Rash Assertions. At first sight indeed he might think they did; but a Second Thought (and such Thoughts, one of his Greek Proverbs says, are the Best) would have inform'd him, that *Horace* had express'd himself with the utmost Caution in this matter; and distinguish'd Critically between that Sort of Tragædy, which was before *Thespis's* time, and That which *Thespis* himself introduc'd.

*Ignotum Tragica Genus invenisse Camæna  
Dicitur, & Plaustris vexisse Poemata Thespis.*

It was *Ignotum Genus Tragica Camæna*, an Unknown Kind of Tragic Poetry, which *Thespis* found out; and that implys I think, that there was Another Kind of Tragic Poetry in use before him. And that this is no New  
In-

Interpretation of the Words, made to serve a Turn, the Dr may be satisfied, if he pleases to consult the Commentators on the place: they are not in Greek indeed, but they speak as Good Sense, as if they were; and some of the Best of 'em give this very account of it.

\* In the  
Life of So-  
lon.

Upon this Bottom we can answer for all the unwary Expressions, that may have dropt at any time from the Pens of Old Writers, in relation to *Thespis*; particularly for that Passage in *Plutarch* \*, where he represents *Thespis*, and those of his time as ἀρχαίμενοι κινεῖν τὴν τραγῳδίαν. What he means by that Ambiguous Phrase, may be disputed; whether it be not, that They first gave Life and Motion to Tragædy, as they certainly did, by taking it in some measure out of the Hands of the Chorus, and making it an *Imitative*, or *Dramatic Poem*: but whatever he means, I think I have prov'd, that he could not mean, consistently with History, that there was no such thing as Tragædy of any kind before the days of *Thespis*. I add, that neither could he mean this, and be consistent with Himself: for he expressly tells us in another place †, that the Acting of Tragædies was One part of the Funeral Solemnities which the *Athenians* perform'd at the Tomb of *Theseus*.

† In the  
Life of  
Theseus.

The Reader may remember a Reflection quoted from *Velleius Paterculus* towards the beginning of this Discourse, where *Homer* is represented as the Author of Epic Poetry, and *Archilochus* of Iambicks, or the Epode: not that they were either of them so, strictly speaking; for *Aristotle* seems to say, that there were

were many Epic Poems before *Homer*, tho' they happen'd to be lost; and that *Homer's Margites* was written, interchangably in Heroic and Iambic Verse, long before *Archilochus*. *Hephaestion* *lays this expressly.* *Paterculus's* meaning was, or should have been, that they each of 'em brought the several Sorts of Poetry they practis'd, and which before them were rough and unfinish'd, to such a degree of perfection, as that they justly deserv'd to be call'd the Fathers of 'em. And in This Sense it is that we must understand those Authors, who make *Thespis* the Inventer of Tragædy; or allow, that they spake inconsiderately, and against the Clear Truth of History. I question not, but some Hundreds of Years hence, *Butler* will be thought the Author of *English Burlesque*; tho' there were many Little things written in that way, before His *Hudibras*: but He having so far outstripp'd those that wrote before him, and carried that Sort of Verse up to such a pitch of Excellence, will probably be esteem'd and call'd the Inventer of it; and his Predecessors not be thought worth mentioning, or remembering.

By this time I hope the Reader is satisfied, that Two of the Three points, which *Dr Bentley* has advanc'd on this head, are altogether mistaken; that, allowing *Thespis* to have been the Author of Tragædy, yet he might have invented it time enough for *Phalaris* to hear of it; and that *Thespis* was not the first, but (to comply with the *Dr's* manner of speaking) the *Second* Inventer of it. His *Third Assertion* is yet more extravagant, and further from all Colour of Truth, than either of

the former : it will be easie to confute it, if we can but understand it.

\* P. 40. *Neither was the Name of Tragædy (says he \*) more ancient than the Thing — What does he mean? Names I thought were invented to signifie Things ; and that the Things themselves therefore must be before the Names by which they are call'd : but he opens himself, — as sometimes it happens when an Old Word is borrow'd and apply'd to a New Notion. Right ! it sometimes happens that a Word is Older than the Thing to which it is apply'd ; but Names can never be before the Things they belong to. But to forgive him This want of Exactness, among a Thousand ; I agree perfectly with him, that the Word Tragædy was not more ancient than the Thing ; they were, as he says, born together, or at least pretty near one another : but for that very reason I infer, that the Word Tragædy was long before Thespis, because I have prov'd that the Thing it self was : and he could not therefore favour my pretensions more, than by allowing that they were born together. However, this Twin-Birth must be understood of Tragædy in its first Infant State, as it took its rise from the *Dithyrambicks* of *Bacchus* ; for the Name of Tragædy was undoubtedly more ancient than the Thing, that is now, or has generally been for Two thousand Years understood by it. It cannot reasonably be question'd, but that those *Bacchic Hymns* they sung in Chorus round their Altars (from whence the Regular Tragædy came) were call'd by this Name ; the Etymology of the word shews that it belong'd to 'em ; for whether it be deriv'd*

riv'd from *τρυγή* [vindemia] or from *τρυγών* [hircus], joyn'd with *ὠδή*, (in which the Grammarians are divided \*) either way it very naturally expresses some of the Great Circumstances of that Solemnity: according to its First Derivation, it points out the Time of it, which was upon the Gathering in of their *Vintage* †; according to its Second, the Sacrifice it self, at the Offering of which these Odes were sung.

\* There is a Third Etymology of the word from *τρυγῆ*, the Lees of wine, and *ὠδή*: but the Reason of it falls in with that of the first.

ἀρ' ἔῃ ἐκ τρυγῶδια τὸ πρῶτον ἐκλήθη ἢ κωμῶδια. Exce. Athen. p. 40.

But as to This we are in the dark, and have only probabilities to guide us; it may with more assurance be said, that under the word Tragedy both Tragedy and Comedy were at first comprehended: which double Use of the Word continu'd also, after these Two Sorts of Dramatic Poetry were sufficiently distinguish'd; as we may learn from (a) *Athenaus* (a), from *Aristophanes*, and his *School* (b), and from *Hesychius* (c). If This be so, as above.

(b) In his Notes on this Verse in *AXAPNHΣ*, *Att. 2. Sc. 5.* Μέλλω δὲ τῆς πέλεως τρυγῶδιαν πικρὴν [Κωμῶδιαν] ἥτοι διὰ τρυγῶ ἐπὶ θύλῳ λαμβάνειν, τὸ δὲ νέον δινόν ἢ διὰ τὸ, μὴ ὄντων πρὸς σωπείν πικρὸν ἀρχῶν, τρυγῶ χριέδω τὰς ὀφείας. And again in his Notes on this Verse in *ΣΦΗΚΕΣ*. — δεινὴς γινώμης, καὶ μεζονοῦ ἢ ὅτι τρυγῶδεις ἀνὰ τὰ μεζονοῦ ἢ χυτὴ πικρὴ Κωμῶδιαν, &c. p. 476. And in the 12th Book of *Athenaus*, c. 13. there is a Fragment of *Aristophanes's* *ΓΗΡΥΤΑΔΗΣ* preserv'd, where *Τραγῶδης* signifies a *Comedian*, — τῶρα μὲν Σαν υῖον — Ἀπὸ τοῦ Τραγῶδαν. The same word *Τρυγῶδια* signifies Tragedy properly so call'd, in this Passage of *Aristophanes*, αὐτὸς δ' ἔρδεν ἀνὰ βάδω πικρὴν — Τρυγῶδιαν. (*AXAPN. Att. 2. Sc. 3.*) for This is spoken of *Euripides*. Besides These, there are Two other Passages in the *Prolegomena* to *Aristophanes*: — πικρὸν αὐτὸν δὲ [i. e. κωμῶδιαν] καὶ τρυγῶδιαν κατὰ διὰ τὸ, &c. *Prol. ad Arist. δὲ Κωμῶδης* — ὅτι δὲ πικρὸν αὐτὸν καὶ τρυγῶδιαν, διονα τρυγῶδιαν πικρὸν, καὶ τρυγῶ καὶ κατὰ ἀπὸ ἐκ κωμῶδων. *Ibid.* (c) *Hesych.* in Voce τρυγῶδαν.

and Comedy was more ancient than *Thespis*,  
 (a) P. 140, as I have prov'd before (a) in these Papers ;  
 141. it is clear that the Word Tragædy was be-  
 fore *Thespis* too. I will detain the Reader no  
 longer upon so plain and known a point, and  
 which I did not think any man, that had the  
 least Skill in these matters, would have put  
 me to the trouble of proving.

I have mention'd once or twice the Early  
 Mixture of Satyr and Ridicule that crept into  
 this Serious Poem ; it certainly did so, and  
 continu'd very long in it, even after Comæ-  
 dy set up for a distinct sort ; and, it is to be  
 thought, even to the days of *Thespis* himself,  
 if not afterwards. His moveable Stage, a Cart,  
 was not probably free from that Scurrility and  
 Buffoonery which were so usually utter'd from

(a) Βοῶς ἰν' αὐτῷ ἀπὸ τοῦ αὐτοῦ  
 μᾶλλον ἔστιν ἐξ ἀμαζῆς —  
 Demosth. contra Æsch. §. 37.

that place, that ἐξ ἀμαζῆς, and (b) ἐξ ἀμαζῆς λέγουσιν, be-  
 came Proverbial Expressions  
 for Satyr and Jeering. I de-  
 sire this may be observ'd, be-  
 cause it gives us an easie and natural account

of that expression in *Phalaris* [κατ' ἐμὴν τραγῳδίαν  
 γελοῖον] which Dr Bentley has made such hi-  
 deous work with : for the meaning of that is  
 no more than this, that they wrote *Lampoons*,  
 or Satyrical Verses upon him ; with which  
 the Tragædies before and about his time  
 (I have said) were usually twisted. So that  
 tho' *Phalaris* could not be the argument of Tragæ-  
 dy while he liv'd, (as our Critic learnedly ob-  
 jects) yet he might be the argument of that  
 Sort of Satyr which usually accompanied Tra-  
 gædy: and the Dr may perhaps, before he  
 dies, have a convincing Proof, that a Man  
 may

may be the Subject of such Tragædies, while he is Living.

And now, upon the whole, is not Dr Bentley a most Discreet Writer? who has chosen out such an argument to prove *Phalaris* Spurious, as his best Friends would have pitch'd upon to prove him Genuine? for *τετραστιχα* in the days of *Phalaris* took into its signification somewhat of a *Lampoon*, or Abusive Copy of Verses, according to the Use of it in the Epistles: but it had nothing of that Sence in the Sophist's time, let the Dr place him as high as he can.

I have nothing more to say to the Dr upon any of his Arguments against the Authority of *Phalaris*; I have consider'd 'em All, with great Fairness, I am sure; and, I fear, with more Exactness than they will be thought to deserve. I will not follow his Pattern so far, as to shut up these Reflections by saying, that *I have had too much Regard to him in giving him the Honour and Patience of so long an Examination* \*: the Regard I had was to my Self, \* *Dissert.* and to those Excellent Persons, who were injured on my account; and, to do right to Them, aversè as I am to Employments of this nature, I could think no Trouble too great, no Task too mean. p. 55.

If I am capable of judging either of Dr Bentley's Performances, or my Own, the Case stands thus between us: Of the *Five General Arguments* he has produc'd, the *Four first* are Evidently against him; neither the *Dialect*, nor the *Age of the Greek*, nor the *way of Counting by Talents*, nor the *Matter and Business of the Letters*, can in the least shock a Considering



Reader; the Only Point that can possibly prejudice him, is that of their *Lying hid for a Thousand Years*: and how far I have taken off the Force of this Objection the World must judge.

Among his *Particular Proofs*, That which relates to the *Towns* is so involv'd in Obscurity, that I must own 'tis perfectly clear'd on neither Side: that *Three* of 'em, notwithstanding what He has said, may be as Old as *Phalaris*, I think I have made out; and for the *Fourth*, *Tauromenium*, I have shewn, that the Single Author he depends upon, gives inconsistent Accounts of it: and should either of those accounts be admitted, I have further shewn, that the *Epistles* no where necessarily imply, that there was such a Town when They were written.

The *Proverbs and Expressions* found in Later Authors, are such Slight and Insignificant Objections, that 'tis no piece of Vanity to say, I have effectually remov'd 'em.

And as to his *Words of Art*; the First of 'em, about the *Thericlean Cups*, has indeed a Shew of Proof, but no Proof at the bottom; the Next, taken from the Term *Philosophy*, has not so much as the Shew of a Proof: and the Last, from *Tragædy*, is indeed a Proof, and a Good One; but it makes directly against him.

There are then in his Whole Dissertation but *Three Points*, that can be thought to affect the *Epistles* even by a Careless Reader; That of their *Lying hid for a Thousand Years*, that of *Tauromenium*, and that of *Thericles*: Of these  
the

the *Two* first he borrow'd from Me (a), without acknowledging the Debt, or making the least Improvement of Either; the *Last* he was probably so happy as to light upon in turning a Dictionary: all that Glitter of Quotations, with which he shines upon this Article, was drawn from Honest *Hesychius*, one of the great Storehouses of his *Alphabetical Learning*.

(a) — *Sunt cur iubi-rem an Phalaris jure vendicet sua. Neq; enim facile poterant Li-tere & a*

*Viro tam insigni scripta, & in suo genere absoluta, ultra mille annos ignota penitus latere* —

*Quod si vera refert Diodorus Siculus, Tauromenium, ad cujus ciues hic Auctor scribit, & conditam fuisse, & eo nomine donatam post Naxum à Dionysio Juniore dirutam, actum est de Phalaridis Titulo, & ruit omnis male sustentata Conjecturis Autoritas. Præf. Phalar.*

The only thing in his Piece, that is clearly made out, and may seem material, is his Proof of *Ocellus Lucanus's* being Genuine: but 'tis such an one, as proves at the same time, that *Phalaris* too may be Genuine, and destroys the force of all he has said upon the Article of the *Dialect*; and is so far from being *New* and his *Own*, (as he has the Modesty to pretend) that 'tis taken Word for Word out of an Author (b) that writ above fifty Years ago; the Scarcity of whose Book, and the Probability of not being trac'd, encourag'd him to set up for a Discoverer.

(b) *Vergat-nius.*

This is a Short and True Account of Dr *Bentley's* Whole Performance: if he be of Opinion, that I have undervalu'd any of his *Arguments*, I am willing, Weary as I am, to try 'em upon *Another Subject*; to propose 'em in their Natural Light and Force, and see whether he will admit the Conclusion.

IF Dr Bentley's Dissertations should outlive some Centuries, which I am far from thinking they will ; and should be read, which I am still farther from suspecting : and should the Criticks of succeeding Ages start an impertinent Dispute, whether they be Genuine or not ; I am of opinion as Strong and Concluding Arguments may be brought to prove 'em Spurious and falsely ascrib'd to Dr Bentley, as any the Dr has us'd to shew the Letters now in Debate to be a Thousand Years Later than *Phalaris*. They may carry the Dr's Name in the Front of 'em, as the Letters do that of the Tyrant ; but Those who examine 'em closely, and try 'em by the Rules of Criticism, which the Dr has here establish'd, will easily Discover the Imposture. For we will suppose, that after those Papers have lain hid and neglected for some Ages, they may unluckily fall into the hands of a Critic, who has Leisure and Ill Nature enough to trouble Himself and the World with a Nice Enquiry, whether they are Genuine, or not : I think he would, or might, in Dr Bentley's Way and Manner, and for the most part in his very Words too, argue against their being truly His to whom they are ascrib'd \*. " The Sophist, whoever he was, that wrote these " Loose Dissertations in the Name and Character of Dr Bentley, (give me leave to say this now which I shall prove by and by) had not so bad an Hand at humoring and personating, but that Some may believe

\* The lines  
that have  
Comma's  
on the side  
are in Dr  
Bentley's  
own Language.

" lieve it is the Librarian himself who talks  
 " so big ; and may not discover the Ass under the Skin of that Lyon (a) in Criticism and Philology. " But I shall examine Dr <sup>(b) Differ.</sup> p. 11.

" *Bentley's* Title to these Dissertations, and  
 " shall not go to dispossess him by an Arbitrary Sentence in his own Dogmatical Way,  
 " but proceed with him upon a Lawful Evidence, and a fair Impartial Tryal. And I  
 " am very much mistaken in the Nature and  
 " Force of my Proofs, if ever any man hereafter, that reads them, persist in his Opinion of making Dr *Bentley* the Author of these Criticisms (b). <sup>(b) Ibid.</sup>

" Had all other ways fail'd us of detecting <sup>p. 13.</sup>  
 " this Impostor, yet his very *speech* had betray'd him, for it is neither that of a Scholar, nor an Englishman ; neither Greek, Latin, nor English, but a Medley of all Three : He had forgot that the Scene of these Writings was *London*, where the English Tongue was generally spoken and written ; as, besides other Testimonies, the very thing speaks it self in the Remains of *London* Authors, as the *Gazetts*, the *Cases* written by *London* Divines, and others. How comes it to pass then that our Dr writes not in English, but in a Language farther remov'd from the true English Idiom than the Doric Greek was from the Attic (a) ? Why does Dr *Bentley*, an <sup>(c) Ibid.</sup>  
 Englishman, write a New Language, which <sup>p. 40, 41.</sup>  
 no Englishman before ever wrote, or spoke ? How comes his Speech neither to be that of the Learned, nor that of his Country ? but a mix'd particolour'd Dialect, form'd out of both ?

\* Differ.

p. 41.

both? " Pray, how came that Idiom to be  
 " the Court-language at St James's \*?

But should we allow, that in some Past Age  
 such a Manner of Speech might have pre-  
 vail'd among Englishmen; yet there will still  
 " lie another Indictment against the Credit  
 " of these Dissertations, on the account of  
 " the English of the True Age of Dr Bentley  
 " not being there represented; but a more  
 " Recent Idiom and Style, that by the whole  
 " Thread and Colour of it betrays it self to  
 " be written in an Age very distant from His.  
 " Every Living Language, like the Perspiring  
 " Bodies of Living Creatures, is in perpetual  
 " Motion and Alteration; which in Tract of  
 " time makes as observable a Change in the  
 " Air and Features of a Language, as Age  
 " makes in the Lines and *Mien of a Face*. All  
 " are sensible of this in their own Native  
 " Tongues, where continual Use makes every  
 " man a Critic: so that there is no English-  
 " man but thinks himself able from the very  
 " Turn and Fashion of the Style to distin-  
 " guish a fresh Composition from another an  
 " hundred Years old †. Now, when we  
 compare these Dissertations with the Writings  
 of Archbishop Tillotson, Bishop Sprat, Sir Wil-  
 liam Temple, and Others, we find the Style of  
 that Age had a quite different Turn and Fa-  
 shion from that of our Dissertator. " Should I  
 " affirm that I know the Novity of these Dis-  
 " sertations from the whole Body and Form  
 " of the Work; none perhaps would be con-  
 " vinc'd by it, but those that, without my  
 " Indication, could discover it by themselves.  
 " I shall let that alone then, and point out  
 " only

† Differ.

p. 57.

" only a few Marks and Moles in 'em,  
 " which every one that pleases may know  
 " them by \*. In the 14th Page, the most \* Differ.  
*timid*; for which the Ancients would have <sup>P. 52.</sup>  
 said, the most *doubtful*, or *scrupulous*: in the  
 46th, *Negoce*; for which they would have  
 said *Dealing*, *Commerce*, or *Intercourse*: in the  
 47th, *repudiated their Vernacular Idiom*; for  
 which they would have said, *laid aside their*  
*Mother-Tongue*: in the 16th Page, a finall *Dose*  
 of Sagacity; for which they perhaps would  
 have said a small *Share*: in the 59th, *Manufa-*  
*cture*, for the forging of a Story; never us'd  
 by the Ancients in that Sence, but always for  
 the work of the *Hand*, not that of the *Brain*.  
 They that will make the search, may find  
 more of this sort. as *brittle Compliments* (a), <sup>(a) P. 22.</sup>  
*incurable Botches* (b), <sup>(b) Ibid.</sup>  
*broaching of expressions* (c), <sup>(c) P. 28.</sup>  
*lopping off branches of Evidence* (d), <sup>(d) P. 29.</sup>  
*Putid Formality* (e); <sup>(e) P. 58.</sup>  
*Men springing up like Mu-*  
*shrooms out of Rotten Passages of Authors* (f), <sup>(f) P. 118.</sup>  
 and many others of the same Strain: " but I sup-  
 " pose These are sufficient to unmask the Re-  
 " cent Sophist under the Person of the Old  
 " Librarian (g). <sup>(g) P. 53.</sup>

But were it possible to produce an Author,  
 of the same Country and Age with Dr *Bent-*  
*ley*, who wrote in the Language of this Differ-  
 tation; yet still it is absurd to think that one  
 of his Education, Character, and Station  
 should be the Author of it. For Dr *Bentley*  
 is known to have appertain'd to the Family  
 of a Right Reverend Prelate, who was the  
 Great Ornament of that Age; to have had  
 an University-Education, and to have convers'd  
 much in the City, and at Court; and with  
 these

these advantages, he could not but be more refin'd than the Writer of this piece of Criticism; who by his manner of expressing himself shews, that he was taken up with quite other thoughts and different Images from those that use to fill the Heads of such as have had a Learned and Liberal Education. For this Sophist is a perfect *Dorian* in his Language, in his Thoughts, and in his speaking. The familiar expressions, of *taking one tripping* (a), *coming off with a whole Skin* (b), *minding his bits* (c), *a friend at a pinch* (d), *going to blows* (e), *setting horses together* (f), and *going to pot* (g); with others borrow'd from the Sports and Employments of the Country, shew our Author to have been accusom'd to another sort of Exercise, than that of the Schools.

(a) P. 27.

(b) P. 32.

(c) P. 34.

(d) P. 36.

(e) P. 57.

(f) P. 65.

(g) P. 63.

\* Dissert.

P. 43.

† P. 45.

\* Ibid.

"Some Persons perhaps may Gratuitously undertake to Apologize for Dr Bentley about this matter of the Dialect\*: they may plead in his behalf, that he was born in some Village remote from Town, and bred among the Peasantry while Young; and for that reason "might ever after have a Twang of the Country Dialect. Now if any one knew "an Express Testimony that he was bred in "the Country, he can teach me more than I "at present remember. This I know in general† from *Anthony Wood* and others, that many have come from the Employments of the Country to be Doctors in the University; "and so He may come in among the rest. "But then must his Language be ever afterwards Doric, because he had once Footing "in a Country Town\*? The same Author tells

tells us of several born and bred in the Country, who yet in Process of Time have learnt to speak a different Dialect from that of their Mother-Village. "Why then must "Dr Bentley's Dialect still needs be Doric? "and that so tenaciously, that twenty Years "living in the Universities and City could "not at all alter it in one of that Education †? † P. 46. He was part of that time a Library-keeper to a Learned Dean, and afterwards to His Majesty; a Member of one University, and a Sojourner in the other; a Chaplain in Ordinary to the King, and a Tutor in extraordinary to a Young Gentleman: "and could not that "Perpetual Negoce and Converse with Gentlemen and Scholars bring his Mouth by "degrees to speak a little finer? Would "not he that aim'd at the Reputation of a "Polite Scholar, and for that reason had apply'd himself in a particular manner to the "*belles Lettres*, have quitted his Old Country "Dialect, for that of a *Londoner*, a Gentleman, and a Scholar? and nor, by every "word he spake, make the Ridiculous Discovery of his being a Perfect Stranger \* to \* P. 46. all Polite Learning, and Gentleman-like Conversation?

"But let us hear a Second Apology that "may be made for the *Dorism* of Dr Bentley: He may perhaps be defended from "the like Practise of others, who being *Londoners* born or bred, have repudiated the "Vernacular Idiom of the City for that of "the Country, as Sir Roger L' Eſtrange in his "*Aſop's Fables*, Sir John Suckling in his "*Bal-lad*, and Mr Dryden in his *Harveſt home*.  
"So



" So that tho' Dr *Bentley* be suppos'd to be a  
 " Native of *London*, or bred Liberally, yet  
 " here is an Excuse for his quitting the City  
 " Language. But I conceive, with submissi-  
 " on, that this argument is built upon such  
 " Instances as are quite aliene from the case  
 " of our Dissertator. For Doric might in-  
 " deed be proper for Fables, or Ballads,  
 " where Brutes, or Peasants are brought in  
 " speaking; or for Scotch Songs, and the  
 " Chorus of a Comedy, on the account of  
 " the Doric Music: but it has not Grace and  
 " Majesty enough for the Subject Dr *Bentley*  
 " is engag'd in. What affinity then is there  
 " between Dr *Bentley's* case, and that of Wri-  
 " ters of Fables, Ballads, and Comedies?  
 " what mighty Motives can here be for assu-  
 " ming a Foreign Dialect? His Pieces are  
 " dated in the midst of *London*, directed to  
 " the very next Street, address'd to a Scho-  
 " lar, about a Controversie in Criticism, de-  
 " sign'd for the view of men of Literature,  
 " and not written to express the humor of  
 " the Country, or to entertain men of Low  
 " Rank and Character. If any will still ex-  
 " cuse the Dr for Dorizing in these Circum-  
 " stances, 'tis hard to deny them the glory of  
 " being the humblest of his Admirers and  
 " Vassals (a).

(a) Differ.

p. 50, 51.

The same Apology that is made for the  
 Doric way of speaking, may perhaps be urg'd  
 also in favour of that *Mix'd Language* which  
 runs throughout these Dissertations. The  
 Speech of *Alexander Bendo* by the Earl of *Ro-*  
*chester*, the Pedant in *Ben Johnson*, and other  
 Writers of Comedies, do shew, that the Au-  
 thor

thor of those Reflections, tho' he carries this way of speaking farther than any ever before him did, is not Singular in the Use of it: but this Plea also will admit of a Ready Answer; that tho' this manner of speaking may be proper for Mountebanks and Pedants, whose business it is to appear Learned to the Ignorant; yet that does not justify the use of it by One, who was reckon'd a Scholar in a Discourse address'd only to Scholars. " 'Tis very  
 " strange, that a Critic, and such a Critic as  
 " Dr Bentley, should so doat on the Dialect  
 " peculiar to Pedantry, who was so eminent-  
 " ly *μωρο* — the hater of Pedants (a); and (a) *Dissert.*  
 so well known to be so, that even our So- *P. 41.*  
 phist in these very Dissertations represents him as One whose Aim, Profession, and Imployment it was to pull off the Disguise from those little Pedants, that have stalkt so long about, in the Apparel of Heroes (\*).

(\*) *Ibid.*

" But I love to deal Ingenuously; and will *P. 29.*  
 " not conceal One Argument, which tho' it  
 " will not do the work, let it go however as  
 " far as it can (b), in favour of their Opi- (b) *P. 25.*  
 nion who may ascribe these Dissertations to Dr Bentley. There is still extant a Letter of Dr Bentley's to the Reverend and Learned Dr Mill which is confess'd to be Genuine; in which there are frequent Scraps of Greek intermix'd with Latin: which might give occasion to our Sophist to think that a Cento of Different Languages was a Characteristic of this Author: but the case of this Epistle is widely different from that of these Dissertations. For the Author of the Epistle writing to One who had a particular Value for the Greek Tongue, shew'd

shew'd an Excellent Judgment in passing such a Compliment on that Language, as to use it instead of Latin, even where Latin would have done as well. But besides, he had occasion to express himself in Terms of Archness and Wagery, which the Latin Tongue would not come up to. For *Johannule* was not in use; and therefore *'Iwawvidov*, or *Little Jacky*, was the only word that could serve to express that in short, which the Latins cannot say but by a Periphrasis: Whereas these *Dissertations* were design'd for the benefit of English Readers, who had as great an Esteem for their own Tongue, as either for Greek, or Latin; and the Uncouth Words here interspers'd do not add any Beauty to the Style, nor do they convey the Author's thoughts to our Understanding with more Dispatch, or Clearness than plain English would do.

I doubt not but our Sophist had that Letter (a) P. 36. of Dr Bentley, to Dr Mill before his Pen (a), when he counterfeited these Dissertations in the Name of that Reverend Doctor. For 'tis very observable that the Preface of this Letter to Mr Wotton is borrow'd from the Preface of that to Dr Mill; which begins with the Author's remembring a Discourse be-

(b) Or *Malelas*, or *Malala*, or *Malalas*: for that weighty Controversie about the right Spelling this Word is not yet fully decided.

tween Him and Dr Mill about *Malela* (b), and a Promise that Dr Bentley had upon that occasion made to his Friend, of which he was to acquit himself in that Letter: this our Sophist transcribes, changing only the Names, and ascribes it to the same Dr Bentley. Had that Dr really wrote these *Dissertations*,

tations, his Invention was not so narrow and stinted, that he should be forc'd to borrow from Himself; especially having so large an Acquaintance, as he appears to have had, with Works of the same Stamp and Character with the Epistle he was writing; as *Prefaces*, *Prolegomena*, *Apparatus's*, *Introductions*, &c. but it was Natural Enough for a Sophist, in his *Mock-Bentley*, to filch an *Exordium* from the Undisputed Writings of the true *Dr Bentley*.

The same Letter to *Dr Mill*, which has furnish'd us already with one Detection of the Imposture, will, if strictly examin'd, make a Second Confession from these

Words; *I had this, sweetest Sir, to say of Alcmaeon, and Alcmaeonides, which I presume no man ever said before me; for I do not like their ways, who, being pitiful Jackdaws, by begging here and there a Feather, pretend to set themselves off for right Genuine Peacocks.* " Now here

Hæc habui, Milli Jucundissime, quæ de Alcmaeone & Alcmaeonide, ore, ut opinor, alio indicta dicerem: non enim placet eorum ratio, qui, cum meræ Corniculæ sint, emendicatis hinc inde Plumis germanos Pavones se pollicentur. P. 20.

" agen am I concern'd for our Sophist, that he  
 " is taken tripping. For he values himself  
 " highly, and expects great Thanks for a Discovery \*  
 " very \* about *Ocellus Lucanus*, which had \* P. 47.  
 been long before made and publish'd by *Vizzanius*, in his Edition of that Author; and whence 'tis evident it was transcrib'd by our Sophist into his Dissertation. Now would *Dr Bentley*, who professes himself such an Enemy to borrowing, have thus plum'd himself in borrow'd Feathers? " It is a very  
 " Notable Discovery, and we are much  
 O " oblig'd

" oblig'd to the Author of it : but then there  
 " was either a strange Jumping of Good  
 " Wits, or the Dissertator is a Sorry Plagia-  
 " ry. What shall we say to this matter ?  
 " Dr Bentley had the Character of a man of  
 " Probity and Parts, who had neither In-  
 " clination nor Need to filch the Sayings of  
 (a) P. 33. " Others (a). Those must be unacquainted  
 with his Character, who think he would say  
 in his Own Name what he found said to his  
 Hands. In the Letter to Dr Mill he omits  
 several things very proper to his purpose, *Least*

Ne fortè qui Me minùs  
 norunt, Pauli me Leopardi  
 Scrinia compilare existiment.  
 Ep. p. 4.

*perchance* (says he) *those, who*  
*are not so well acquainted with*  
*me, should think, I had plunder'd*  
*the Escriture of Paulus Leopardus.* Would he be There so

afraid of being thought to transcribe *Leopardus*? and would he Here value himself upon  
 Discovering first what he plainly copies from  
*Vizzanius*? Must those, who think he could  
 borrow, be such as did *not know* him? and  
 can we, when we know him upon his Own  
 Declaration to be so averse from borrow-  
 ing, imagine he would borrow That from  
 another, for which he solemnly bespeaks  
 Thanks from the Learned World? " This  
 " bears hard upon the Author of the Differ-  
 " tations : but how can we help it? he should  
 " have minded his Hits better, when he was  
 " minded to act the Doctor.

But that Letter to Dr Mill will afford us  
 still greater Conviction, that this Dissertation  
 could not be the Genuine Work of Dr Bent-  
 ley. For that Letter, in the Page above men-  
 tion'd, represents Dr Bentley proving, that  
 he

he could not easily be deceiv'd in knowing whether a Greek verse were ascrib'd to its

proper Author: For in such things as these, says he, I do not easily suffer my self to be impos'd upon; who, as you know, had once a design to publish the Fragments of all the Greek Poets, with Emendations, and Notes, a grand work: but now, as they say, another sort of Life, another sort of Diet. Now

is it probable, that One who had collected the Fragments of all the Greek Poets, amended them, and wrote Notes upon them, could mistake *Empedocles* for an *Epic Poet*? But I shall not insist upon this; since the Passage produc'd carries in it a more Direct and Express Proof that *Dr Bentley* could not write these Dissertations. He had design'd once, it seems, to publish his Grand Work, the Fragments of the Greek Poets: but he was now, he tells us, engag'd in another way of Life, and must therefore apply himself to another sort of Studies: for that I take to be the Import of the Greek Proverb. Now the Dissertations in dispute bear date after this Declaration; they pretend to be written by *Richard Bentley* Dr of Divinity, and Chaplain in Ordinary to His Majesty; they would be thought to come into the world some time after his Lectures were printed in defence of Religion. He was now therefore engag'd in another Profession; and would not, we may be sure, meddle with a Subject so foreign to the business of a Divine, nor handle it in a manner so ill becoming that Character. He, who scrupl'd

Nam in his Rebus verba mihi dari haud faciliè patior; qui, ut scis, Fragmenta omnium Poetarum Græcorum cum Emendationibus, ac Notis, Grande Opus, edere constitueram: nunc, ut ajunt, ἄλλοτ' βίῃ, ἄλλῃ διαίτῃ.

Ep. p. 20.

publishing those Fragments, which might have been of good Use to the Learned, and might some of them have fallen in with Divinity, would much less have taken up with such Thin Diet, and mispent so much of his precious Time upon so fruitless Enquiries as those are which are pursu'd in these several Dissertations. " There is another thing, besides a " pretty Invention, useful for a Lyar, and " that is a Good Memory. We will suppose " our Author to have once known something " of this Declaration of Dr Bentley; but he " had, it seems, unhappily forgot it, when " he ascrib'd these Pieces to him \*.

\* Dissert.

p. 17.

The Sophist is not more happy in personating Dr Bentley, when thro' the whole Course of these Dissertations he represents him as a Fierce and Angry Writer; and One, who when he thinks he has an advantage over another Man, gives him no Quarter. For the Writer of the Epistle to Dr Mill, when he had just occasion to be very Severe on some, who had taken wrong measures in deducing the Etymology of a Greek Word, thus represents his Indignation: *But I will not say any thing severely of 'em; it is not in my nature to trample upon the Prostrate.* This shows him to have been a Man of

Sed nolo aliquid inclementer dicere; non nostrum est xepiweis iμyβαλλειν.

Ep. p. 4.

Temper, and Good Nature: But our Sophist represents him as one that has no Mercy upon his Adversary, when he thinks he has him in his power. The suppos'd Editors of *Phalaris* for an imagin'd mistake in a point of Criticism are expos'd as *Nonsensical Blunderers*, Persons who had neither Skill nor Industry, neither Know-

*Knowledge nor Ingenuity; to be like Lencon's Affes, a degree below Sorry Criticks, to write directly against Grammar and Common Sense; and are set out to the world under this Low and Rude Similitude: Here are Your Workmen, to mend an Author, as bungling Tinkers do Old Kettles! What a difference is there between the Two Letter-writers? Mr Bentley is calm and forgiving, but Dr Bentley is furious and unrelenting: Dr Mill's Friend scorns to insult over the Prostrate; but Mr Wotton's Friend pursues his Blow: "and don't You yet begin "to suspect the Credit of the Dissertations\*? \* Dissert.*

Dr Bentley was celebrated amongst the Learned Men of his own and other Countries for one, who was much vers'd in the Learned Languages: and, as it appears by his Letter to Dr Mill, he was very conversant in *Suidas, Hesychius*, and other Greek *Vocabularies, Onomasticons, Etymologicons, Lexicons, Glossaries, Nomenclators, and Scholia*; so that he must at least have been acquainted with the Significations of Greek Words: but it appears from what this Sophist offers about the Sense of some Greek words † which he finds in *Phalaris*, that he was not only a perfect Stranger to the best Classic Authors, but that he wanted that Light which any Ordinary Dictionary would have afforded him. The Librarian was so well read in One of these Instructive Writers, *Hesychius*, as to assure Dr Mill, between Verse and Prose, that, whenever a New Edition of that Book came forth, he could, if he would, correct five thousand faults in it, more or less, that had till that time

P. 62.

† From the 62d to the 68th page of this Book.



defeated the Sagacious Conjectures, and Laborious Diligence of other Criticks (†). Now could any thing that actually is in *Hesychius*, escape his knowledge, who had such a Deep Insight into what *is not*, but ought to be there? could He, who had discover'd what had escap'd the Utmost Diligence of Others, miss what was obvious to every one that look'd into *Hesychius*? Would Dr Bentley have given us such a Cast of his Skill in construing Greek Words, as to tell us, that *διώκει* <sup>anciently</sup> signified to pursue, when that which fled fear'd and shunn'd the pursuer; and that it never signified to follow, in any other Sence; when *Hesychius* gives us no other words for *διώκει*, but *ῥάκε*, *ἐκτρέφει*, which are far from a Persecuting Sence?

Dr Bentley is known to have liv'd in the same Age, and at the same Time, that the Edition of *Phalaris*, with which this Sophist is so angry, came out: it appears, from the Editor's Preface, that the Dr, being then Library-keeper at St James's, deny'd a Common Favour to the Editor, which is complain'd of in that Preface: This doubtless gave occasion to our Sophist to forge these Dissertations in the Dr's name, to show his pretended resentments of that Complaint. Now the Dr himself could not be ignorant, that this Edition was put forth by Mr Boyle, whose Name it still bears. But Our Sophist, who liv'd at a greater distance from those Times, supposes it the Joynt-Work of several: he talks of *our*

(†) Id Tibi de plano possum promittere, Milli, Quinque plus minus millia mendorum Me correcturum esse, si libuerit, quæ aliorum *εὐσεχία* & laboriosam diligentiam hactenus illuserunt.  
Ep. P. 39.

Late Editors, of those Great Genius's, with whom Learning, that is leaving the World, has taken up her Last Residence; of these Annotators, of our Ingenious Translators (a): whereas these Edi- (a) Differ. tors, Genius's, Annotators, Translators, could not p. 66, 71. but be known to one that then liv'd, and were known to Dr Bentley (as appears by a MS Letter of his to Mr Boyle, now in being) to be one and the same Person. It is true, that in the Preface to the Edition there are these Expressions, *Quantum scimus*, and *Nostro Labore*; and in the Dedication, *Tuâ ope adjutus*. which might lead our Sophist into a mistake, that this Edition was the Work of More than One; and that the Person, to whom it is dedicated, had assisted in it: as if it were unusual for the Plural Number to be put for the Singular; or as if a Person in that Station could no otherwise assist a Young Gentleman of his College in the Edition of a Book, than by collating Manuscripts, translating the Text, and writing Comments.

Dr Bentley is known to have enjoy'd the advantage of a Public Lecture, instituted by the Honourable Mr Robert Boyle, and by reason of that Post must be suppos'd to have had a due respect for his Name and Family; so that it cannot rationally be presum'd, he would treat a Gentleman, who had the Honour to be nearly related to that Noble Person, with so much Contempt and Indignity, as is plainly express'd in several parts of that Dissertation.

Dr Bentley did also flourish during the Life of Sir William Temple, whilst that Eminent Person was in great Reputation for the Signal and Extraordinary Services he had done for

the Protestant Interest, to the English Nation, and to the King who then reign'd ; as also for his Learned Writings, which were then in very great Esteem amongst all those who had a true relish for Sound Sense, and Noble Thoughts, express'd with all the Beauty and Force of proper and significant Language. Now, tho' the Dr might, without any offence, differ in his Sentiments from that Worthy Gentleman ; yet it is not credible that a Scholar, a Courtier, and a Divine would so far break in upon all the Rules of Modesty, Decency, and Civility, as to insult over a Person of Sir William's Character and Merit, as an Ignorant and Illiterate Pretender to Learning ; who could neither discover the true Time, nor the true Value of his Authors ; and whose Choice of Phalaris and Æsop, as then extant, for two great inimitable Originals, was a piece of Criticism of a peculiar Complexion, and must proceed from a Singularity of Palate and Judgment.

“ It must needs be a great Wonder to those who think these Dissertations Genuine, how or where they have been conceal'd ; and in what Secret Shop, or unknown Corner of the World they have lain hid, so that no one has ever taken notice of 'em for so many Ages. Had these Dissertations been seen and read, somebody sure would have quoted somewhat out of 'em ; especially since so many have had occasion to do so (a) : for all those who have written concerning Sophisms, and Ill Consequences in arguing, might have furnish'd themselves from hence with all Kinds of Loose and Incoherent Thinking. And those that have publish'd their

(a) Diff.  
p. 63.

their Censures upon the Incongruities of Language and Innovations in Speech, might from every Page of this Author have fetch'd proper Instances of the Grosest improprieties.

“ So that, by their Silence and Prætermiſſion,

“ they do as good as declare expreſſy, that

“ they never ſaw our Diſſertation (a).

(a) Diſſer.  
p. 64.

But that which ought to weigh moſt with thoſe who have any Honour for Dr *Bentley*, toward clearing him from any ſuſpicion of having written theſe Pieces, is this Conſideration; that That Learned Doctor was choſen out by the then Fathers of the Church, as a fit perſon to vindicate the Truth of Religion againſt Atheiſts, Deiſts, and all other Oppoſers of Divine Revelation: whereas this Sophiſt is found to make uſe of ſuch Arguments (b) to diſprove the Epistles of *Phalaris*,

as are of Equal weight to prove the Writings of *Mofes* and the New Teſtament to be of much Later date, than they can be, conſiſtently with the Pretences of the Jewish and Chriſtian Religion. (b) Vide p. 121ſt of his Book.

“ So little regard had

“ this Bold Writer to fit his Diſcourſes to

“ the Character of that Reverend and Lear-

“ ned Perſon; and I have had too much Re-

“ gard to Him, in giving him the Honour and

“ Patience of ſo long an Examination (c).

(c) Diſſer.  
p. 65.

Since

Since I have given my self the trouble to examine all the tedious *Proofs* Dr Bentley has heap'd together against the *Epistles*, which I was not in the least concern'd to vindicate; I am oblig'd to say something to his *Criticisms* upon the *Edition* that relate entirely to my Self. I shall consider 'em with the same Indifference that I did his Arguments: for as I never profess'd my self a Patron of *Phalaris*; so neither was it ever in my Thoughts to set up for Exactness in that Dry Sort of Learning. I enter'd upon the Work meerly as an Exercise of my Pen; I saw that Life and Smartness, which I still relish in these *Epistles*, quite lost in the Loose *Periphrases*, and plain Country *Latin* (as the Dr calls it) of the former Interpreters. This put me upon trying, whether I could express the *Style*, as well as the Sence, of the Original in another Language; and represent it with such advantage, that They, who are no Masters of Greek, might see some faint resemblance of the Author's Spirit and Genius, in a Translation: in which, whether I have been successful, and to what degree, must be left to the different Humors, and Opinions of Readers. I abhor Vanity, and the more, since I have read Dr Bentley's Book, where I see it makes so unbecoming a Figure: yet This I will be bold to say; that even in those Translations of the Greek Authors, which are esteem'd the Best, would a man of some know-

knowledge in Criticism exercise all the spite and skill he has that way to find out Mistakes, he might be able to muster up such a Penitential Number of 'em, as would keep my Poor Version and Notes in Countenance. I question not but there are Errors and Oversights enow in my Translation: I was very young when I did it; and, to confess the Truth, after I had got a little way into it, and made my first Essays, went thro' the Rest of it without any Great Gust; and 'tis no wonder therefore if I should not be awake sometimes in a Work that I was not very fond of. However, as Many, and as Easie to be found as my Faults are, Dr Bentley has yet had the Ill Luck to miss 'em; and to except against such Passages as can, I think, to any Unprejudic'd Man, be fairly accounted for. The Town, I own, is Weak and Defenceless enough in conscience; but he has had the Judgment to attack it on that side, where perhaps it lies least expos'd. Upon Scouring the first Epistle (as he Cleanlily expresses himself) he finds these Words there,  $\Psi\chi\eta\varsigma\ \delta\epsilon\ \rho\acute{o}\varsigma\tau\omicron\nu\ \iota\alpha\tau\rho\varsigma\ \iota\alpha\tau\alpha\iota\ \theta\acute{\alpha}\nu\alpha\tau\omicron\varsigma\ ,\ \delta\upsilon\ \alpha\nu\epsilon\pi\alpha\chi\theta\acute{\epsilon}\varsigma\alpha\iota\omicron\nu$  &c  $\alpha\epsilon\gamma\sigma\acute{\epsilon}\chi\eta\varsigma$ . Which in my Latin, runs, [*Animi autem Morbum Medica sanat Mors, quam quidem nulli gravem, &c expecta*]. He is pleas'd to render it thus, [*For a Disease of the Soul the only Physician is Death: do You therefore expect a most painful one*] and says, My Translation of  $\alpha\nu\epsilon\pi\alpha\chi\theta\acute{\epsilon}\varsigma\alpha\iota\omicron\nu$  by [*nulli gravem*] produces a flat and far-fetch'd Sence †. I must † Dissert. own, I do not yet see why it is more flat to P. 96. say, a Villain shall die an Unlamented Death, than that he shall die a Painful one: and I as little apprehend, why he calls this a far-fetch'd Sence;

Sence; I suppose he cannot mean, by a *far-fetch'd* Sence, a Sence that the Word ἀνεπαχθὴς is not commonly us'd in; because I never could meet with it us'd in any other Sence, till Now he has thought fit to translate it *most painful*. All the Criticks before him render it by *non gravis*, *non invidiosus*, or by some word Equivalent to these: and *Hermogenes* thought this a proper sence of the word, when he intitl'd a Chapter περὶ τῆς ἀνεπαχθῆς ταυτὸν ἐπαινεῖν; which I would advise the Dr to read, not only to get a better acquaintance with the Word in question, but to learn too the modesty and discretion not to commend himself so often, with so very ill a Grace. I am sure he wants to be taught this; and since he has just now taught me what I knew nothing of before, I could do no less than make him this Grateful Return.

+ Dissert.  
p. 69.

He goes on to instruct me. *The Greek*, says he, *is in the Superlative degree*; let 'em put it then, *nulli gravissimam*, and 'twill shew 'em the Error of their Version †; that is, let Me translate it for 'em, and I'll undertake to make neither Grammar, nor Sence of it. But if he will give me leave to translate it my self, since it must be in the Superlative degree, instead of *nulli gravem*, I would put *minimè invidiosam*; and then I do not yet see any Error in the Version: and I am the more inclin'd to think there's none, because the Dr slides off, and takes Refuge in his strong and secret Hold, the MSS. *The MS*, he says, *reads it ὅτι ἀν' ἐπαχθῆσαιον*; and *They* (as he calls *Me*) *might have embrac'd this Reading, when they saw it there*. What MS is this? None of the *Bodley-MSS* read it so;

NOT

nor the *Arundel*, a Collation of which the Learned *Dean of York* sent me, after my Edition was finish'd. Sure the Dr cannot mean the *King's MS*; he knows I never saw That my self; and I hope I am not answerable for my Collator's Eyes. And, since No-body can see it but Dr *Bentley*, I have no great Reason to depend upon His Ingenuity. However, if this be the Reading of the *King's MS*, 'tis frivolous and fit to be neglected: for to Me the Common Reading seems to have rather a *Quicker Sence*, and (having shewn Dr *Bentley* to be no great Master in Propriety of Speech) I may venture to say, as much *Propriety*. Perhaps the Dr might have thought so too, but that he has a Peculiar Fondness for the *Parapleromatick Particle* *av*, which he takes to be a rare and quaint usage (a): and having met with it Here therefore, is resolv'd not to part with it. To diminish his fondness for it, I promise to furnish him, upon demand, with 30 or 40 Instances from *Homer*, and the *Greek Testament* (to go no further), where the *Particle av* is us'd as *Parapleromatically* every whit as it would be here, should his Reading prevail.

But, to wave entering into a Controversie with him about Particles; let us see, whether he be not as Exquisite a Judge in *Latin*, as he is in *Greek*. He charges me with *Barbarism*, *Nonsense*, and *New Discoveries* in Language, for translating *ἀδίκημάτων ἐκ ἀνοσιώων*, *Scelerum non invita*: for he is very positive, that *Invitus*, always means the Agent, is always spoken of the Person, never of the Thing, &c. But I hope *Propertius*, who liv'd in the Purest Age of *Latin*,



tin, may be presum'd to understand his own Tongue as well as Dr Bentley: He (*El. 16. L. 1.*) expostulating with an Unkind Mistress, says, that tho' she was Cruel and Unrelenting, yet if she did but hear his Complaint,

*Non—ipsa suos poterit compescere Ocellos  
Surget & invitis spiritus in Lachrymis.*

Is *Invitis* here joyn'd with the *Person* or the *Thing*? if *Propertius* had said, as he does in other places, that Tears would flow *ab Invitis Oculis*; tho' an Eye be improperly call'd a *Person*, yet in that case I might allow it to be taken *Personally*: or, had he attributed any *Action* to Tears; as if he had said, *invita surgent Lacryma*; *Lacryma* might be consider'd as an *Agent*: but, as it stands here, *Invita Lacryma* must be render'd *Involuntary Tears*; and, to explain it otherwise, is, I think, contrary to Good Sense and Good Language too. Were Dr Bentley as well acquainted with the Latin of the Great Men in *Augustus's* Age, as with that of the Pedants in *This*; he would have another *Tast*, and another *Style*. To know the Grammar of a Tongue, and to have a just sense of the Proprieties and Elegancies of it, are two different things; as different almost as Construing *Euclid's* Words, and being Master of his Demonstrations. Any body, that will take the pains may be Critically, exact in the Signification and Syntax of Words; but to enter into the Spirit and Beauty of good writing, is an Happiness, that None have, but those who are Born with it; nor all of them neither: for a Long Conversation

sation with Bad Books may destroy a good Natural Taste. I don't say this is Dr Bentley's case; for I am not a Judge, whether he ever had any.

To come a little nearer to *His* Ages of Latin, I will give him a Couple of Instances of the same kind out of *Statius*: One of them from the 9th *Thebais*: where Young *Dryas*, after he was mortally wounded, sends this Message to his Mother,

— *Merui, Genetrix, pœnas; invita capeffens*  
*Arma Puer rapui, nec Te retinente quievi. V. 891.*

*Invita* is here apply'd not to the *Person* his Mother, but to the *Thing* Arms taken up against her Will. In the 7th *Thebais* the *Græcians* are encourag'd by *Jupiter* to make a furious assault upon *Thebes*; and *Bacchus* in his Speech to *Jupiter* on this occasion, says,

*Esto olim invitum jaculatus nubibus ignem;*  
*Credimus: en iterum atra refers incendia terris,*  
*Nec Styge juratus, nec Pellicis Arte rogatus?*  
V. 158.

*Jupiter*, by his Vow to *Semele*, was oblig'd, against his own Inclination, to grant what she ask'd: and therefore the destruction he brought upon her was *Involuntary*: I think *Invitum* can bear no other sense here, and I therefore leave these Passages with Dr Bentley to consider at his Leisure; Let him try his Skill upon 'em, next time the angry fit of Criticism returns.

I see there is no way of pleasing an Incens'd

cens'd Dissertator ; I have just clear'd my self from the Imputation of using a Word in a different sence from other Writers ; and now he accuses me for using a Word in the same sence with all the Authors that ever writ. I translate *ωεστρέπεις* *Hortaris*, which I interpret by *Provocas*, as *Budaus* does ; who, in his Learned Commentary, has these words, *ωεστρέπεις*, *provocant, cient ; & usus est satis frequens :* and I translate it so, because I could find no other Signification of it in any Greek Writer ; and Dr Bentley himself owns as much, that it is no otherwise us'd by any of the *Ancients*. Now I, never designing to make a Noise with the Corrections and Improvement of Old Vocabularies, was contented to use words in the same Sence that every-body had us'd 'em before me ; and for this Error of mine, my Indictment runs, that I am an *Illiterate Fatherer of an absurd, ridiculous, and incongruous Sence upon my Author*. My Plea is, that it seems to Me no more absurd, or ridiculous, that *Phalaris* should say to one of his Enemies, *You provoke me to be Cruel*, than that he should say (as Dr Bentley would have him) *You upbraid me with Cruelty*. And, I believe, his Cavil against the Syntax of *ἐμοὶ ωεστρέπεις*, is no better grounded than that against the Sence. He won't indeed find *ωεστρέπω* in his Grammar with a Dative Case, but he may please to enlarge it from this very place \* : and as for his *ἐς ἐμὴν*, or *ἐπ' ἐμὴν*, we have no occasion for either of 'em : in the days of *Sophocles*, *ταῦτά σε προτρέπω*, was no more absurd and incongruous, than, *Qua me hortaris*, was in *Tully's*. But Dr Bentley thinks he has shewn already, that *ωεστρέπω* signifies

\* Dissert.  
p. 75.

nishes to reproach \*; where has he shewn it? \* *Disserts*  
 he has no where said any thing of it, but in *P. 71.*  
 the 52d page; and there he only says, that  
*προτρέπειν*, to accuse, is an Innovation in Language,  
 for which the Ancients us'd *προφίπειν*: so that po-  
 sitively to averr, and assume the thing in que-  
 stion, is in his Language to shew, and prove it.  
 Let us see now, whether his Second Thoughts  
 furnish him with any better proof of *προτρέπειν*  
 signifying to accuse. One would expect that  
 he should produce the Authority of some  
 Greek Author, that uses *προτρέπειν* in this  
 sence: but he has given this argument quite  
 another turn, and proves, that 'tis us'd so  
 here, because 'tis never us'd so by any ancient  
 Author before the Sophist †; he might have ad-† *Ibid.*  
 ded too, nor by any Modern Author since. *P. 72.*  
 This is a surprizing way of arguing, but I  
 find it familiar to Dr Bentley; he has ano-  
 ther just of this strain, in the 115th page: he  
 says there, *One may know Sabirius Pollo to be a*  
*Roman*; how so? does he find any such Fami-  
 ly among the Romans? no, that's too Obvi-  
 ous a Way of arguing for a man of his Parts:  
 he knows him to be a Roman, because he does  
 not find such a Family as the Sabirii, or such a  
 Surname as Pollo: and he improves this Ac-  
 quaintance with Sabirius so far, that within  
 Three pages he calls him his Friend Sabirius  
 Pollo. Such are the New Ways of Reasoning  
 made use of by this Incomprehensible Author:  
 He has furnish'd us with several; and, to shew  
 that he is not yet exhausted, he brings This  
 argument to prove that *προτρέπειν* signifies to  
 reproach: *προφίπειν*, and *vitio vertere* signifie to re-  
 proach; therefore *προτρέπειν* does so too: and

in the same Paragraph, he after the same manner makes it out, that διατένω is to persevere; is not διατένω exactly the same with pertendo? (meaning, I suppose, that δια is per, and τένω, tendo) and is not pertendo to persevere? I always thought, that Use was the only Rule and measure of the Signification of words; but Dr Bentley, a great Adventurer in new ways of thinking, will determine it by dint of Argument. Would he allow Others to argue as He does, from One Compound Word to Another, and from One Language to Another, we might enlarge our Dictionaries without End; and soon produce not only (what he pretends to \*, five thousand, but five Millions of Emendations and Additions to Hesychius; tho' not such as are worthy to keep Company with the Admirable Bishop Pearson's Observations on that Author: and therefore should they hereafter come together (as 'tis said they will); and should the Bishop's Name not happen to be set to his part (as 'tis possible it may not); it will be no difficult matter to distinguish between 'em. According to the Dr's Rule (not to go far from the words he plays with) because διαφέρειν signifies to differ, therefore by a Like Metaphor, and Analogy, we may use διαφέρειν to express the same notion †: And thus agen I can prove, that παρέρχομαι is to exhort; for is not παρέρχομαι exactly the same as παροτρύνω? and is not παροτρύνω to exhort? or that δύναιμι is to persevere; for is not δύναιμι exactly the same with persisto? and is not persisto, to persevere? So that for ought I can see, it must be allow'd, either that all words may be us'd e'en as we please, or

\* Epistola  
in fine Ma-  
lala, p. 39.

† Dissert.  
p. 73.

or else that *προτρέπω* must signifie, as it has done for above Two thousand years, *hortari*; that is, not always to *Exhort*, (a Word he makes such wretched Mirth with) but to *excite* by any other methods: unless when *Virgil* says, *Jam Vitulos hortare*; and *Ovid*, *Hortaturq; Canes*, they mean, that *Dogs* and *Bullocks* are to be made tractable by good Advice and Exhortation.

If our Critic is unalterably determin'd, that the Sence of this Passage must be [*the Crimes which You upbraid me with*] why should he not chuse rather to read *προτρέπεις* than *προτρέπεις*? for tho' I no more know an Instance of *προτρέπω* than of *προτρέπω*'s being us'd for *ὀνειδίζω*, yet the Formation of the Word will more easily and naturally allow of this use: *ὡν ἐμὸν προτρέπεις* may well enough signifie, *una mihi vitio vertis*; but *προτρέπεις*, in that sence, is, I think, a very improper and unnatural Innovation in Language.

One would wonder, that Dr Bentley should be so eager in imputing this Mistake to my Translation, which he is so little capable of making out; but he had a double End in it: My Explication of the Word offended him so much the more, because it spoilt an Argument that he urges, to prove the Epistles Spurious: I shall draw it up in short, but in its full force and strength; and leave it to the Consideration of the Reader. *Προτρέπω* was never us'd for *ὀνειδίζω* in any ancient Author before the Epistles, nor by any modern Author since the Epistles; nor in the Epistles themselves: therefore the Epistles are Spurious. This Weighty Point is shut up with a Piece of Hi-

story, that is worse founded than his Criticism; and proceeds from Something which was always thought a greater Blemish to a Divine, than want of Judgment. He says, *The Edition ascrib'd to Cujacius, and another of Aldus; tho' the Two Principal of All, and Both of 'em in the Public Library at Oxon; had yet the Odd Fortune to lie all the while conceal'd from*

(a.) Differ.  
P. 73.

*our Late Editors that liv'd there* (a). I am at a Loss how to deal with a man of this Extraordinary Confidence, that can so boldly assert what 'tis impossible he should know. What shall I say to One, who will face me down, that I never saw, what I know my self to have often seen and us'd? Nay, and will prove this to me out of my own Preface? the place he quotes is this, *Codices Impressos quatuor prae manibus habui qui eodem planè Textu utuntur; apud quos Versiones sunt duae, altera à Naogeorgo, altera in Usum Schol. Soc. Jes. edita* (b).

(a.) Vide  
Pref. p. 3.

Two of the Four Books I here particularly mention'd; how does he know but those he mentions are the Other Two I mean? as indeed they are. I had no occasion to name 'em, because I found little Difference in 'em from those which I had in my Own Study: the Version ascrib'd to *Cujacius*, is exactly the same with That, put out for the *Schools of the Jesuits*, which I have expressly said I made use of. A man of any Candour and Fairness, or indeed of any Common Modesty, would not have presum'd upon so slight Grounds, so positively to assert, that I had overlook'd what lay so plainly in my way: but I am the less surpriz'd to hear this from *Dr Bentley*, who would fain persuade me that I never saw my Own Edition.

In

In the Body of this Dissertation there are Two other Mistakes, which the Dr has found in my Version: I took no notice of 'em where they lay; but, to avoid Confusion, reserv'd 'em for this place. The First is, my rendring ποτηρίων Θερικίων, poculorum Vitreorum, as Suidas, Etymologicon Magnum, and Favorinus had done before me. These are Eminent Names in that Sort of Learning, which Dr Bentley seems best acquainted with, and most to value himself upon; and therefore, one would think, should be able to excuse me with him: but his Maxim is, to value nothing any further than it is to his purpose. When Suidas is brought in for preserving some few Fragments of Babrius \*, \* Dissert. then he is a man that converses with Writers <sup>P. 140.</sup> of Size and Quality: but when he is produc'd for that, which will leave us not the least Footstep of our Corinthian Potter (a), and whereby the (a) Ibid. Argument about Thericles would vanish into no- <sup>P. 17.</sup> thing (b); then he is a trifling Scribler, his (b) Ibid. Lexicon consists of Excerpta from Scholiasts and Glossaries (c). If once he begins to Quarrel (c) Ibid. thus with his Good Friends, the Lexicographers, I can expect no mercy from him: But I would ask him, why he says, that, in the particular passage before us, neither the Use of Language, nor Good Sense will allow Θερικία ποτήρια to be translated Glasses? When Phalaris is said to send Cups of Gold and Silver, and besides τινος ποτηρίων, to me it seems agreeable to Good Sense, that these Cups, which are here distinguish'd from Cups of Gold and

† Ἀπὲς αὐ-  
καὶ σοὶ φά-  
λακίον  
χρυσὸν τετ-  
ραεὺς, καὶ  
ἀργυρὸν τετ-  
ραεὺς.  
κατατῆται ἀργυρὸς ὃ καὶ ἡμᾶς τίχνης δ' οὗ, καὶ ποτηρίων Θερικίων  
ζεύγη δίκαια. Ep. 70.



Silver, should not be, as Dr Bentley conceives, Silver at least, if not of a more precious Metal; unless there be some other Metal, besides Gold, more precious than Silver. He may be as merry upon these Glasses as he pleases, and call 'em *Odd and Stingy Presents, Cheap and Brittle Compliments*; I am not answerable for *Phalaris's* Generosity. Besides, I freely own my self Ignorant how cheap Glasses were in *Sicily* two thousand Years ago; for ought I know, they might be Great Rarities, and fit to bear the Rest of his Presents Company; especially being of so Vast a Size, as they appear to have been, and sent in so much greater Number than the Other Presents were: for the Epistle tells us, there were but *Two* Cups of Silver, and *Four* of Gold; and *Ten* Couple of those of *Thericles*. From whence one would be apt to conclude, that they were of a *Baser*, and not of a more precious Metal than Silver and Gold, as the Dr imagines. I can bear all his Rail-lery upon *Phalaris* here for a *Stingy* Present: but why is he offended with Me too for a *Present* I never design'd him? He says I have presented him with an Emendation of *Poculorum Vitreorum*, whereas the former Interpreters honestly translated it, *Thericlean Cups*. But I must put the Dr in mind to quote those *Honest Translators* honestly: he knows One of the *Two* translates it *Poculorum Vitreorum*, as I do; I mean *Cujacius* (or whoever else be the Author of that Version ascrib'd to him) whom the Dr is pleas'd to say, I never saw.

With the same Sincerity he tells me, that, whereas I have render'd *πικρὸν δίκαιον*, in *morem*

AT 411

*arundinis* (a); the Translation in the former Editions was, *instar pinus* (b). Here again I have follow'd the Version, which he advises me to consult in my next Edition (c), the Version of *Cujacius*, which has it, *in morem Arundinis*: and this I did, because I thought it would be a greater piece of justice to my Author, to make the Passage in him Clear and Intelligible, than to translate a Greek Proverb Literally, which would have been no Proverb in Latin. Dr Bentley would probably have interpreted it Literally, on purpose to have had an occasion of explaining it; I could have done so too, and have cramm'd a Page of *Erasmus* into my Notes, as He has here into his Dissertation: but I am glad I translated it as I did; for 'tis pity the Dr should have wanted an Opportunity of shewing how excessively Witty he could be upon this Proverb. *Ἐκ τῆς ῥα αὐτῆς πίτυος δίκην*, says *Phalaris*, *I will extirpate them like a Pine-Tree*; and this Tree (according to the Dr's Natural History) *perishes by Lopping*. He takes this Hint to tell me, that I have lopp'd off a Branch of his Evidence \*, that I have executed this Proverb upon it self, and extirpated the Pine-Tree out of my New Version; that I have rooted up the Pine-Tree, and transplanted Reeds \* thither: which he confesses is above his Small Understanding in Gardening \*. What a Deluge of Wit is here! all these fine things are said within the Compass of half a Page: who can resist a Writer, that thus takes care, that his Fancy shall still keep pace with his Judgment; and that the One shall not Instruct You more than the Other Entertains

(a) Ep. 92.

(b) Dissert.

p. 29.

(c) Ibid.

p. 75.

\* P. 19. 30

You? However, after he has refresh'd himself a little, he must give me leave to tell him, that his *Understanding in Gardening* is indeed very *Small* (as small as his Knowledge in Natural History) if he thinks that it has any thing to do either with *Reeds*, or *Pines*; which, I take it, grow as rarely in Gardens, as *Mushrooms* arise out of *Rotten Passages in Authors*. Dr Bentley must indeed be allow'd to understand Some part of Gardening very well; particularly *Transplanting* and *Weeding*: The first of these he has prov'd his Skill in by those Few Notions that are worth any thing in his Piece; for they are *transplanted* from Other Mens Prefaces, the Nurseries of all his Critical Learning: His Skill in the Second is made out by all the Rest of his Appendix; which is nothing else but a Collection of Ill *Weeds*, pull'd up out of Good Writers. There is, I remember, a Passage in *Athenæus*, where this Happy Talent of *Weeding Authors* is very well express'd: I shall give it the Learned Reader, together with three or four Lines that introduce it; because it is, all together, one of the Shortest and Liveliest Accounts I have met with of a Man possess'd with the Spirit of Criticism.

(†) The E. Οὐδὲν ἄλλο σὺ δεῖδα, says *Cyrulcus* to *Ulpian*, pitomizer ἢ λόγους διεξοδικούς ἐπέν, ἐκ ἱστορίας μνηστῶνα, ἢ τῆς ἐπ' of *Athenæus* λόγοις χάριτες ἀπέρχασθαι ποτε: ἀλλὰ χεῖνον ἀπαντα σέει us, at the ταῦτα κατετρίβης ἡντῶν, καὶ, ἢ καὶ; (†) ἔρη; ἐκ ἔρη; very entrance, tells us, this *Ulpian* was such an insufferable Pedant, that he would neither Eat nor Drink any thing till he had ask'd the Questions καὶ, ἢ καὶ; and satisfied himself in what Greek Author the Word, by which it was call'd, was to be found; from whence, he says, he got the Name of *Κατέχευε*: which, I desire Dr Bentley, may be added to *Chlontachomklus*, as a Like Instance of the Name of a man but once mention'd in old Authors.

ἐξουχίζεις τε πάντα τὰ ἐροπίποντα τοῖς σωδισλεγόμε-  
νοις τὰς ἀκάνθας σωάγων,

Ὡς ἀν' Ἐχινόποδας, καὶ ἀνὰ τρηχέαν Ὀρνυιν.  
αἰὲ διατρίβων, Ἀνθίων οἷον ἰδίῳ ἐδὲν σωαθροίζων.  
L. 3. C. 17. A Character, which will fit the  
Ulpian of Our Time, as well as those of  
Athenaus's; for the Race of 'em is not yet ex-  
tinguished.

I have follow'd our Dissertator thro' a long  
Scene of Impertinence; and am come at last  
to That Part, where he Places his greatest  
Strength; that is indeed, the most Trivial  
Part of all, the MSS. I told the Reader in  
my Preface, that I only made use of such dif-  
ferent Readings in the MSS, as conduc'd to  
the better understanding the Text; for I al-  
ways thought it a Ridiculous piece of Pedan-  
try to load a Book with various Lectures to  
no purpose: but this I find Dr Bentley calls  
*Skill in using MSS*. He and I differ in our  
Notions about these matters; and I hope we  
always shall.

In the 64th Epistle, the Printed Copies  
read, ἐγὼ δὲ ἐνδέξερτον ἦδ' ἡ φεύγω πάντας ἀνθρώπους.  
I saw the MSS here had a Various Reading,  
ἢ δ' αἰ for ἦδ' ἡ, which I pass'd over with that  
Contempt it deserv'd, and guess'd it should  
be ἐκτενέστερον; a Reading, that, with a very  
small Alteration, made my Author speak Sense:  
Let us see, what Dr Bentley, and his MSS  
make of it. Phalaris says, νῦν ἔδ' ἐ τοῖς ἀναξαρ-  
τάτοις ὁ ὥμαι· ἐγὼ δὲ ἐνδέξερτον ἦδ' ἡ φεύγω πάντας ἀνθρώ-  
πους: πῶς γὰρ ἔτε παρ' ἄλλοις πῶς, ἢ τ' ἐν φίλοις βέβαιον  
εἶεν. Which I would render thus, *I am not  
so much as seen by my Nearest Relations; and I*  
now

now the more carefully avoid mankind, because I have found no Faith nor Trust, not only among Other Persons, but even among my Friends themselves. Dr Bentley says, we must take ἡ δὲ here for a certain Correction. But since the Tyrant is giving a reason for his present Recluse way of Living in opposition to his former freedom and openness, methinks ἡ δὲ can't well be spar'd here. Besides [I avoid all mankind less than I ought to do] seems to Me a very improper expression; especially after a Man has said, that he avoided all mankind to such a Degree as not to be seen by his Nearest Relations, would he add immediately, that he avoided Company less than he ought to do? What would Dr Bentley have him do more? or how can a Man be more retir'd than by seeing no-body? I desire the Dr to have some Regard to Sense, as well as to MSS.

This ἐνδεέστερον returns agen in the 68th Epistle, ἐμαυτὸν ἐνδεέστερον εὐρίσκω ἢ δὲ χρυσότητι παιδὸς ἀντιπετῆν. Now here too, he says, Every one of the MSS have it ἡ δὲ. As for the King's MS, no body knows what it has, or has not; and this Epistle is wanting in one of the Bodley MSS: so that all these MSS, that I have overlook'd, prove at last to be but One; in which perhaps I might not observe this Various Reading. But if I had observ'd it, I think I should scarce have made use of it; for if we put ἡ δὲ in the room of ἡ δὲ, ἐνδεέστερον must be an Adverb, and referr'd to ἀντιπετῆν: and the Rules of good Language will hardly allow, that the Adverb should be joyn'd in Place to  
one

one Verb, and in Sence to another, at such a distance : not to insist on the Ambiguity that arises from its Neighbourhood to *ἐμαυτῷ*, to which it seems to be naturally joyn'd as an Adjective ; and 'tis with some difficulty, that we bring our selves to understand it otherwise, even after the Correction of *ἡ δὲ* into *ἡ δὲ* is allow'd to prevail. Had the Author intended *ἐνδεέστερον* for an Adverb, he would probably have put it after *ἐνείκω*, and not before it. I am so us'd to Dr Bentley's Language, that I can easily bear his telling me here, that *I make meer Nonsense of the Context* : whether I do or no, must be left to those who will take the trouble of considering it. Indeed such a fair and ingenuous Translator as Dr Bentley, that renders *ἡ δὲ τὴν παρὸς αἰτέμεν*, *than I want Money to give*, may make Nonsense of any thing.

There is yet one Instance more of Unskilfulness, that he charges upon me, *διατείων ἐν οἷς ἔσται*, I translate, *perpendens suam Conditionem, considering the Circumstances he is in*, as *Naogeorgus* had translated it before me ; the Dr renders it, *persistens in proposito, proceeding in his present ways*, according to *Cujacius* : neither of us produce any Instance of our Use of the word *διατείω*, nor pretend to do it ; we are meerly upon the Guess, what it must signify, by its relation to the Sentence : and which of us guesses best, is to be determin'd by our Readers. Had I been never so much out, he might have taken a more Courtly way of letting me know it, than by saying, that *Leucon carries one thing*, and *his Ass another* ; that is, the Writer of the Greek Epistle means

means differently from the *As* his Editor : This is such a Compliment as there is but one Proper way of Returning ; Gentlemen do not use to resent such Language with their Pens only. But I forgive him ; 'tis a Mode of Speech familiar to him, I find, and which he bestows on every one he has to deal with. In the 11th page, the Sophist is an *As* under the Skin of a Lyon ; in the 59th, Phalaris himself is a meer *Asinus ad Lyram*. Since he is so fond of *Asinine Proverbs*, I will throw him in One out of *Aristophanes*, to Compleat his Collection. It is, *Ὁρ' ἄγαν μυστήρια* ; upon which *Erasmus* has this Remarkable Gloss ; *Asinus portans Mysteria, in eos dicebatur qui prater dignitatem in Munere quopiam versantur ; velut si quis ignarus literarum Bibliotheca praeferretur : in* English thus, The Proverb of an *As* carrying Mysteries, was apply'd to Those who were preserr'd to some Place they did not deserve, as when a Duncce was made a Library-keeper. And if that Library-keeper should so far mistake his Office, as to think he was put there not to shew Books to Gentlemen that came to see 'em, but to keep the Door shut, he would be still more unfit for the Place. I have had Worse Treatment than this from Dr Bentley : for he has not only deny'd my Collator the use of the King's MS, but dealt with me all-along, as if I had seen it, and us'd it my self ; once before, in the case of *ἐν δέσσεινον ἢ δειν*, and here agen in relation to *διατίμων*. Having no Authorities to countenance my Version of *διατίμων* by *expendens*, I laid hold of a different Reading in the King's MS, sent me by my Collator, where he assur'd me it was *διδίμων*.

Dr

Dr Bentley puts on his Critical Spectacles, and finds, that tho' it be *διὰ πῶν* now, it was originally *διατέιναν*; and that the *ε* has been *erased* by a modern hand, as appears by a *Void Space*: and upon this he triumphs over my Skill in perusing the MS, when he knows it was fifty Miles off of me, all the Time of the Edition. What *Void Spaces* now appear in that MS, how many *Erasings* there are, or by what *Hand*, it matters not much to dispute, or enquire. I own I overlook'd the *false accenting* of these words, which he charges me with: but to set down my translation of *διὰ τινων*, *ob ea*, and at the same time to say, I make it an *Interrogative*, is according to Dr Bentley's way of representing things: he should either have been less severe with Me (a) on the account of My mistakes of this kind, or have taken more care to prevent his Own; Some of which, since he condescends to these Trifles, I shall so far comply with him, as to give the Reader an account of.

(a) Nos Phalaris Grammaticum habemus, Cic. in Fij. i. e. qui perperam scripta etiam capite punit.

P. 8. *τίνας ἀν* for *τίνας ἀν*. P. 19. *εἰτέ* for *εἰτέ*. P. 18. *μὴδ' ἀν* for *μὴδ' ἀν*. P. 21. *εἰτε τὰς* for *οἷτε*. P. 35. *ὡς φάσιν* for *ὡς φασί*. P. 45. *Ἰάνας* for *Ἰονας*. P. 48. *ζῶα* for *ζωά*. Ibid. *ἐπειδ'* for *ἐπειδ'*. P. 61. *πάντα* for *παντᾶ*. P. 70. *ἀν* for *ἀν*. P. 94. *συνέχραψέ δέ* for *συνέχραψε δέ*. P. 129. *χτλείπομεν* for *χτλείπομεν*. P. 138. *ἡπτάμυλ* for *ἡπτάμυλ*. P. 139. *ἐλασίς* for *ἐλάλεις*. Ibid. *Οὐδ' οἱ* for *οὐδ' οἱ*. Ibid. *ἄδῃ* for *ἄδῃ*. P. 146. *ἔταρον* for *ἐταῖρον*.

The



The Reader will think the Controversie runs low, when we begin thus to dispute about Accents and Encliticks; and indeed I think so too: but how can I help it? My Excuse must be, that I was oblig'd to engage the Dr in what way he lik'd best, and had not the Choice of my Own Weapons.

And now are not These, which I have gone thro', Mighty Blemishes to my Edition? and fit to be insisted on by the Dr, in order to Humble Me and *my Teachers*? He takes care to tell me, that he can produce more Instances of this kind; I question not but he may: but if he can find out no more Considerable Mistakes than these, I think he may leave off Criticizing upon this Subject.

For my part I am not much concern'd, what the Men of Letters think of my Skill in Languages or Manuscripts: but it concerns *Dr Bentley* to consider, what the Men of Sincerity will think of his false and disingenuous Dealing; what the Men of Modesty and Humility will think of his Lofty insulting Language; what the Men of Good Nature and Candor will think of his Fierce and Vindictive Temper; how the Men of Taste and Breeding will relish his Scurrilous Language, his Frigid Jest, his Low and Clownish Expressions; how the Men of Reason and Judgment will approve his Weak and Inconclusive Ways of Arguing: it is a mighty Imputation upon Him, to have any of these Bad Qualities, or to want any of these Good ones: but it is no Great Blot upon Me, if I should appear not to be exactly well skill'd in the Learned Languages.

I was

I was satisfied from some Books lately written, what a wide difference there is between a Man of Close Arguing, and Rambling Learning; and how unnatural a Step it is for an *Amanuensis* to start up a Professor of Divinity. This indeed made me not expect much from Dr Bentley in the Reasoning Way: but when he came to Matters of Pure Criticism, I thought One, who had bent all his Thoughts and Reading that way, One who has now the sole Use and Power of the Kings Library, and had for many Years attended upon one of the Greatest Scholars in *Europe*; One that set out with all these Advantages, I thought, might easily have confounded a Young Writer, that never aim'd at being a Critic in the Greek Tongue, or made the Niceties of it his peculiar Study and Business. But, to consult the several Editions, to collate the Manuscripts, to turn over Dictionaries, nay, and to make 'em; and all this ado, only to find a false Accent, and an Escape in perusing a Manuscript (which I have shewn to be the utmost of the Dr's Atchievement on this Article) seems to Me to favour too much of the Character of those men, who, as he himself makes the Observation, without considering whom it hits, love to make a Noise about Trifles; or (not to wrong him of his Own more Elevated Expressions) *to make a Tide and a Flood in a Basin of Water.*

Nothing has done Learning more disservice among the Sensible part of Mankind, than that indiscreet Value, which Men of Letters oftentimes put upon the most trifling parts of Knowledge; that *μεγαρολογησία* in the way  
of

of Scholarship, of which *Theophrastus* has given us a Character, as it relates to Humane Life and Affairs. 'Tis this that has brought so ill a Report upon Criticks and Criticism, and sunk extremely the value of that Sort of knowledge, which has been of such Excellent use to the World, when wisely employ'd.

A Good *Critic*, is a Name that deserves Honour; for it carries in it Probity, Learning, Relish, Good Nature, and Good Sense, with a great many Other very desirable Qualities: but, as the Word is now generally employ'd, to signify a Captious, Vain, Opinionative, Half-learn'd, Ill-natur'd Censurer of other Mens Labours, I must confess, I think nothing can be more despicable. Let us stop a while, e'er we take our Leave of this argument, to consider their several Characters.

A Good Critick distinguishes himself always by the Choice of his Subject; it is some Point of Importance, and worth determining: an Ill One is ever busied in things of no manner of Use nor Consequence; and yet is as full of Himself, and his Performances, as if the Commonwealth could not subsist without 'em.

A Good Critic is modest and Decent in his Censures, Candid and Impartial; he treads warily, uses his Judgment much, but distrusts it more: speaks with Respect of those he differs from; never takes a pleasure in insulting over their Mistakes, or lessening their Reputations. *Isaac Casaubon*, *Ger. Vossius*, and *Grotius*, were all men of this Cast; and so was *Menage* too, till *Baillet*, toward the Latter End of his Life, provok'd him. The Character

rafter which our Excellent *Pearson* \* gives of him, is very remarkable, and fit to be considered by Dr *Bentley* before he appears again in the way of Criticism. *Quanta animi moderatio ! quantus Candor ! veram Criticam cum nullius famæ dispendio exercere ; nullius Existimationem ledere, nullius Erroribus insultare, nusquam ex Mustaceo Laureolam querere ; per quos profeceris aperte profiteri ; à Viris Doctissimis non nisi salvo eorum honore, aperte dissentire : ut exclamare cogar, O Jecur verè Criticum sine Splene !* In which also he drew his Own, as well as *Menage's* Character.

*Salmasius* and *Scaliger* had nothing of this in 'em, they were all Gall, and Pride, and Pedantry ; which made the Vast Learning they were Masters of sit so ill upon 'em, that the World hated and despis'd 'em, at the same time that it was profiting by 'em : Mr *Wotton* tells us, *There are some now alive whose Fame will one day equal that of the Scaliger's* (or, as it is in his last Edition, the *Salmasius's*) and *Grotius's* of other Nations †. If he had put *Salmasius* into *Grotius's*, and not into *Scaliger's* Room, I would so far have agreed with him, that there are some now alive, who will inherit Their Fame, as to One great part of their Character ; for they have All their Ill Qualities in Perfection---with but a slight Mixture of any of their Good ones. For my part, were Dr *Bentley* as great a Scholar, as Some say he is, or even as He thinks himself to be : yet I had rather not know the Greek Alphabet, than have his Knowledge, and his Manners together : for as

Q

much

\* In his Letter to Menage before Diogenes Laertius.

† Reflect. upon Anc. and Mod. Learning, p. 385.

much as I value Learning, I value Good Sense, and Common Civility more.

A Good Critic is rich in his own Store ; he has a sure Fund of Good Judgment and True Knowledge, which he can trust to upon all Occasions, without needing to rifle his Neighbours : but an Ill Critic, who sets up the Trade without a Stock to manage it, must be perpetually upon the Plunder : the great Employment of his *Sagacity* is, to find out Hints in Odd Corners of Books, where, 'tis probable, no-body else will look for 'em ; the chief Exercise of his Judging Talent lies in distinguishing, what Borrow'd Notions he may most safely put off for his Own, and with the least danger of being Discover'd.

A man of a sound and well weigh'd Judgment is afraid always of standing by himself in a New Opinion ; but a Smatterer in Criticism is bold, and forward ; loves to maintain Paradoxes, and to defie the World. 'Tis enough to make him think a thing true or false, that every-body else has thought the contrary : for he has no way of Distinguishing himself, but by being Singular.

A Critic Really such, always proportion's his pains to the difficulty of the matter he is engag'd in, and dwells upon things more or less, as they want more or less to be dwelt on : but a Pretender is constantly improper and impertinent in his Learning ; where the Knot of a Dispute is, there You find him very reserv'd and silent ; but he lets loose all his Criticisms upon You in plain points, that No-body is in danger of misunderstanding.

*So have I seen the lost Clouds pour  
 Into the Seas an Useless Shower ;  
 Whilst the vex'd Sailors curs'd the Rain,  
 For which Poor Shepherds pray'd in vain.*

To compleat the Character of a Critic, it is requisite, that he should write well in that Way he pretends to censure ; and be a Good Pattern, in order to be thought a Good Judge. The Ancient Criticks were generally so, as *Aristotle*, and *Longinus*, *Tully*, and *Quintilian* : but *Some now alive* have ventur'd to Criticize upon the Performances of very fine Pens, while they themselves had the worst in the World ; and have set up for Judges of Good Writing by a Taſt form'd upon the Opinions, and in a Style drawn from the Expressions of Modern Prefaces and Comments.

'Twere endless to reckon up all the Particulars that distinguish their Characters ; instead on't, take a Reflection or two which Monsieur *St Euremont* \*, (a Fine Writer, and a Good Judge) has made on this Subject.

\* Oeuvres  
 mêlées,  
 Troisième  
 Tome,  
 p. 28.

*I have seen ( says he ) of Late Years, Great Criticks in abundance, but few Good Judges. That Learned Tribe is my Aversion, who are perpetually busie in restoring corrupted Passages, that when restor'd are at last worth nothing. They set the highest Price on such Knowledge, as one would chuse to be without ; and know least of those things which most deserve to be known. Having no fine way of thinking and speaking themselves, they can never enter into the Delicacy of another Man's Thought or Expression. They would succeed very*

well in explaining and commenting upon a Grammarian; for His mind is thrown into much the same Mould with Theirs, and his Studies have lain the same way: but when they come to one of the Sensible and Wellbred Writers of Antiquity, they neither relish, nor understand him. His Sense, and way of Thinking, must needs be lock'd up to 'em; 'tis so very different from their Own. In History, they know nothing of Men, or Affairs, they turn all to Chronology; and so they be but able to tell You, what Year Such an One was Consul, they care not whether they are acquainted with his Character, or the great Events that happen'd in his Time. Cicero with them goes only for a Maker of Orations, Cæsar for a Writer of Commentaries; the Consul, and the General, are lost to 'em. The Genius that animates their admirable Writings is not felt; the Remarkable and Instructive Passages there are not observ'd.

I beg the Dr's Pardon for leading him into such Writers as *Bruyere*, and *St Evremont*, who think well, and speak Justly, and quote little; I know, upon all these Accounts, they are not for his Taste: to oblige him therefore, I will throw in a Little Latin here from the Preface of a *Modern Critic*; and I hope it will go down with him the better for the sake of the Place where I find it. *Hic Criticum*, says my Author, *non Pedagogico Fastu tumentem, aut Farragine quâdem Jejuna Eruditionis onustum formare aggressus sum, sed non minus Judicio quam Memoria sua utentem; & qui probè calleat, quàm pauca penitus in Veterum Monumentis intelligamus, idèq; Modestè de aliis judicet, & ab Omnibus discere sit paratus. Volo enim ante omnia niti intelli-*  
gere

gere quid Veteres velint ; & sibi diligenter cavere, ne Opinetur se Scire quod Nesciat \*. Which • Le Cler. Præf. ad. Art. Crit. Good Measures had Dr Bentley, in his Critical Studies and Attempts, vouchsaf'd to observe. he had sav'd himself and Me the trouble of this Public Dispute about *Phalaris* : He had not rashly enter'd the Lists upon an Argument which he is by no means a Master of ; nor begun an Indiscreet Controversie, without considering where it might End.

He threatens me and the World with some farther Remarks of this kind in *Latin* : I am not, I confess, very apprehensive of that ; because, if he had intended to write in that Tongue, it had been proper to have done it at first : for in that Tongue the Reflection, that has given him all this Uneasiness, was written ; and in that Tongue therefore one would think it should have been answer'd, and this whole Controversie manag'd. But whatever He may do, I cannot promise him that No other Language will be employ'd against him ; nor that the Enquiries of Some, whom he has affronted, will not be extended a little farther than these *Dissertations*.

I was indeed in hopes, when I first put Pen to Paper, that the Dispute would have lain purely between Us Two, and have been decided by an Appeal to the Learned Men of our Own Nation : but I find the matter is not likely to rest here ; Dr Bentley's Boasts of his Correspondence abroad, and of the Compliments that from thence have been paid him, have made it necessary to set Him and his Performances in as true a Light towards Foreigners, as they do, or will appear in here at Home.



particularly to let Monsieur *Spanheim*, and Monsieur *Grævius* know, how mistaken they have been in placing their Civilities upon One that does not deserve 'em ; and can never be valu'd, but where he is not known.

If therefore I have not made use of all the Advantages against *Dr Bentley*, which he has given me, nor display'd Him fully in all his Colours ; those Defects, I hope will soon be supply'd by a Better Hand, that intends to do right to the Subject, and to the Dr's Character, in a Tongue that will last longer, and go further : for, since *Dr Bentley* has appeal'd to Foreign Universities, to Foreign Universities he must go.

---

---

Dr *Bentley's* Dissertation  
UPON THE  
Fables of ÆSOP,  
EXAMIN'D.

I Had laid together some Short Remarks upon the Rest of the Dr's *Appendix*, which were intended to accompany These : but I shall be oblig'd to leave *England* before I can put 'em into Order. However, I cannot part with the Dr. till I have given him my Thoughts of his Performance on *Æsop*; and examin'd, whether he has any better Grounds for opposing his Judgment to Sir *William Temple's*, in the case of the *Fables*, than in that of the *Epistles*. I cannot stay long enough on the Subject to do right to it; but what I shall be able to say, will, I hope, sufficiently prove, that the Reasonings and Discoveries in this latter part of his Work are perfectly of a piece with those we have already had to do with; and, let him dispute against *Phalaris*, or *Æsop*, or

what else he pleases, that Dr Bentley will be Dr Bentley still.

He sets out well — *I am glad*, says he, *to find a good part of the Work done ready to my hand. For Monsieur Bachel, Sieur de Meziriac, has writ the Life of Æsop in French* \*. Which Life the Reader now supposes that Dr Bentley has read, and found to agree exactly with his own Sentiments; but to his surprize 'twill appear, that the Dr has neither read it, nor seen it: for in the Next Line he confesses that he *could never meet with it*. So that he finds his Work done to his hands in a Book that he has not yet found: Books Lost, and Books not yet come to his View, are as instructive to Him as any Books in his Study. There is no dealing with such a Profound Scholar as this, who is as well read in what he has not seen, as in what he has. But perhaps here, as in Other cases, he has his accounts at Second Hand: not so neither, he is purely upon the Conjecture; and *can guess from the great Learning of the Author known to him by his Other Works, that he has in a manner exhausted the Subject*. That is, by his Mathematical Notes upon *Diophantus* he can guess what he says upon *Æsop's Fables*. But, methinks, 'tis a little nicely guess'd, that *Meziriac* has in a manner exhausted the Subject: why should not a Man, that had written so well upon *Diophantus*, have quite exhausted it? I begin now to guess something too; and may be able to make out my Guess, e're I am a Month Older: I am going into a Country, where *Meziriac* is, I suppose, to be had; and, when I have seen him, perhaps I shall find, that Dr Bentley has  
seen

\* Dissert.  
p. 35.

seen him too ——— tho' he forgotten it. For he pretends to present us here *only with such Things as have escap'd the Observation of Others*, and I now know him so well, that I suspect him a Course whenever he sets up for Discoveries. The Business of *Ocellus* has given us One Remarkable Instance of this kind; and this small Piece we are upon will presently, even without the help of *Meziriac*, afford us Another.

The first of his *few loose Things which he fancies have escap'd the Observation of Others*, is, *that 'tis very uncertain if* (he would say *whether*) *Æsop himself left any Fables behind him in Writing*. This Hint has I believe escap'd the Observation of Others: for they that have observ'd any thing about it, have observ'd the contrary. The Phrase of Antiquity is the same, when they mention any thing of *Æsop's*, as it would have been, had they thought *Æsop* really to have wrote it; the Ancients quote him just as they do Other Authors: when *Plato*, *Aristotle*, *Aristophanes*, *Plutarch*, *Galen*, *Themistius*, *Gellius* cite any thing from him, 'tis *ὡς ἔφη*, *ὡς ἔρατκε*, *ὡς ἔλεγε*, καὶ τὸ Ἀισωπον, καὶ τὸ Ἀισώπου μῦθον, *inquit*, &c. And how would they have express'd themselves otherwise, if *Æsop's* Writings had confessedly lain before them? Dr *Bentley* sure will not be so Captious as to say, that these Forms of Speech are not express enough; among all Authors that quote from others, *ὡς ἔφη* and *ὡς ἔρατκε*, are Equivalent, and us'd indifferently. Bishop *Pearson* has largely prov'd this in his *Vindicia Ignatiana*\*, against *Daille* who laid hold of this\* *Par. 1. f* Cvil, to disparage the Epistles of *Ignatius*: P. 83.  
And

And I the rather referr the Dr to that Incomparable Work, because *he confesses, with some shame, that he had either never read it, or utterly forgot it* \*. A good account of his Acquaintance with one of the First Books in the World, in the Way of his Profession ! They that read Books at this rate, will be sure to write Books that will be so read. But not to forget our business — The Word *ἔγραψεν* it self is apply'd to *Æsop*, as an Author, by

(a) \* *Ἀριστοφάνων συνῆψε-  
ται τὰς μύθους Περὶ οὐμν.*

(b) \* *Ἐγραψε τὰ ἐν Δελφοῖς  
αὐτῷ συμβάντα ἐν βιβλίοις  
β'. μᾶλλον ὅτι πνέσσανται ἂν  
σώπον Ἀποκρίματα γεγρα-  
φέναι μόνον.*

(c) *Suidas* explains *ἀπα-  
κρίματα* by *λόγους*, in that  
very place.

*Suidas*, *Aphthonius* (a), and others : What *Suidas* says, deserves a Reflection ; his Words are (b), *Æsop* wrote Two Books of what befel him at Delphos ; but Others are rather of Opinion that he wrote nothing but Fables (c). So that, tho some doubted, whether he wrote any account of what happen'd to him at Delphos, yet,

according to *Suidas*, no-body doubted but that he wrote Fables. *Eustathius* calls him expressly not *λογιοποιὸς* only, but *μυθογράφος* ; expounding the one by the other †. The Words too of the Old Scholiast on *Aristophanes* are so full, I think, as not easily to be eluded ; ὁ *Ἀίσωπος*, says he, ἐν τοῖς μύθοις τὰ αὐτὰ λέγει (d). That few say in terms, he was a Writer, is because No-body had any suspicions to the contrary : and when the Doubt was not started, nor thought of, there was no need to guard against it. I have produc'd some Ancients that say, he *did* write ; Dr Bentley does not pretend to instance in any that say, he *did not* : in-  
stead

† Ad ini-  
tium Ili-  
dis A.

(d) Sch. in  
Phil. 1124.

stead of that, his best Arguments for this New Point are these that follow.

*The Old Man in Aristophanes* (says he \*) \* P. 136. learnt his Fables in conversation, ἐμαθεν ἐν Συμπόσιῳ. In which of his Dictionaries does Συμπόσιον signify *Conversation*? Or is it necessary that what was learnt at a *Feast* must be learnt in *Conversation*? might it not be a part of their Festival Entertainments, to have some agreeable Book read to them? and might not *Æsop* sometimes be that Book? If this might be the Case, then the Old man might learn his Fables at a Feast, and yet learn 'em out of a Book too. But suppose he did not, allowing that he learnt 'em in *Conversation*; what follows from hence? that because the Fables of *Æsop* were in every-bodies mouth, and told at their Meals, by way of entertainment, therefore there was no written Collection of 'em, they were preserv'd all by Memory. If this be Criticising, I am sure, Criticising has nothing to do with Reasoning. By the same way of Deduction will I prove, that we have not a *Written Creed* now, nor ever had one: for have not all People from the Rise of Christianity down to this Time learnt it, without the help of a Book? and is it not plain therefore that the Creed is preserv'd by Memory only, and has never been committed to Writing?

The Dr produces a Second Passage in *Aristophanes*, where one man reproaches another's Ignorance, thus ἰδ' Ἀίσωπον πῶς τέχνης, *Tom* have not read so much as *Æsop*; for so he himself translates it: from whence, he says, one might conclude, that *Æsop* wrote his own Fables. If they

they were his *Own* Fables, one might pretty safely conclude that he *wrote* 'em; for those *Writings* are the most properly a man's *Own*, which he *writes*. But Dr Bentley, it seems, concludes from this very Passage, (I cannot imagine How) that *Aesop* did not write 'em. Till he tells us, by what Wonderful means he got to this Conclusion, I can say nothing to it. But as for his Occasional and Weighty Debate, whether or no ἡ Ἀἰσώπου μυθολογία be a Proverbial Saying *spoken of Illiterates* \*; I can see no manner of reason why it was brought in here, but meerly for the pleasure of contradicting *Erasmus*, and *Scaliger*: Proverb, or no Proverb, I think, it equally proves, that there were Fables at that time, which went under the Name of *Aesop*; and what advantage can be made of this, must be against Dr Bentley.

\* Differ.  
p. 136.

The Closing Argument, that winds these Proofs up into a Demonstration, is a Passage in Plato's *Phaedo*, where *Socrates* says: † Among the Fables of *Aesop* I had at hand, and remember'd \*, I put those into Verse, that first occur'd to me: from whence the Dr shrewdly observes, that

† οὗτοι προχέραις ἔχον. καὶ  
ἠπιστα μὲν τὰς τῆς Αἰσώ-  
που, τὰς πρώτας οἷς πρὸς  
τοὺς ἐνέτυχον.

\* Or, knew to be His.

*Socrates* does not say, that he made use of a Book of Fables: and from his not saying so would have us believe that there was no such thing as a Book of *Aesop's* Fables in *Socrates's* time. *Socrates* was now in Prison, and in obedience to a Divine Admonition thought himself oblig'd to do something in Poetry: he pitch'd upon *Aesop*, putting into Verse such of his Fables as occur'd to him; and, if we may guess by what we

we have left of his doing, ſuch Fables occurr'd to him as were neareſt his Own Caſe. Now what need was there of having recourſe to a Written *Æſop*, for that, which he and every body remember'd? or what wonder was it, that he had not the Book by him in Priſon? why, we are not ſure that, at the particular point of time when he did theſe Fables in Priſon, he had ſo much as *Pen and Ink* allow'd him.

This is what might be ſaid, ſuppoſing *ἠπιστάμεν* to ſignifie, *remember'd*, as Dr *Bentley* tranſlates it: but, with his leave, I think the Marginal ſence I have given of the word is the truer, and that the Paſſage ought to be thus render'd; *Among the Fables of Æſop I had at hand, and knew to be his, &c.* for otherwiſe, there will be Three \* expreſſions in this ſhort ſentence, that ſignifie much the ſame thing, over and over agen: a fault in writing, which Dr *Bentley* might eaſily fall into, but *Plato* hardly could. And if this be the true tranſlation of the Words, they plainly, I think, imply, that *Socrates* did make uſe of a Book of Fables; whereas our Critic produces 'em to ſhew he did not.

Of the Three Paſſages then, which he has brought to prove *Æſop* no Author, Two of em †, if they prove any thing, proved dire-  
ctly the contrary: and the Other \* proves  
nothing, but that Dr *Bentley* has read ſome-  
body, that has read *Ariſtophanes*.

This is the Irreſiſtible Evidence, with which Dr *Bentley* has taken upon him to confront the Opinion of Two Thouſand Years; ſuch Evidence, as one would not admit againſt *Sim-  
mias Rhodius*, to rob him of the honour of his

Egg,



*Egg*, or his *Hatchet*. Is it fit, that Men should make use of their little Skill in Letters, their Conjectures, their Fancies, their Dreams, to attack the Reputation of our first Masters in good writing? is it grateful, with such groundless Suspensions as these to fall upon the Father of Moral Fable, whose happy way of conveying knowledge has been ever spoken of with so much Respect, and been of such standing Use to Mankind? Has Dr Bentley sworn to be at defiance, with every Man that writes Masterly in his way? Sir William Temple, I believe, could not be better pleas'd than in being affronted in so very Good Company. Let me tell our Critic, what I have heard from Wise Men, that Confidence and Paradoxes are not the true way to a Lasting Reputation; that the first point of Modesty and Sense is, never to Contradict the whole World Needlessly; and the next to that, to be sure never to do it, but upon very good Grounds.

The Dr often gives me an Occasion to put him in mind of this Truth; and more than Once in the very Passage we are upon: where he has laid hold of a Careless Expression in *Laertius* (a Writer of his Own Form) to oppose *Plato's* Account of *Socrates*, or rather *Socrates's* Account of himself. *Laertius*, he says, seems to hint that *Socrates* did but One Fable: and this seeming Shadow of an Hint, even from *Laertius*, is to bear down the Express Authority of *Plato*, who says he did Several \*. The very Spirit of *Athenaus* is got into him, who † undertook to disprove some of the most Remarkable Particulars of *Socrates's* Life recorded in *Xenophon* and *Plato*, by the very

\* See the Passage before quoted p. 236.  
† L. 2. c. 15.

very same *Negative Way* of Arguing, that Dr Bentley makes use of against *Phalaris* and *Æsop*; the *Silence and Pratermission* of *Authors* (a): nay, and expresses himself in the same Mannerly Way too, calling *Plato*, the best-bred Man in the World, *Dog*, and *Liar*; covertly indeed, whereas Dr Bentley has be-

stow'd much the same Titles (b) on those He disputes against, bluntly and openly. But the Impartial *Casambon* takes the part of those Great Men, against his Author; reproves his Rudeness, and confutes his Reasonings; and shews him to be, as Confident Clowns generally are, all over mistaken (c). The Men of Letters, I hope, will excuse this Freedom; No man is readier than I am to value *Athenaus* for what he ought to be valu'd, the *Fragments* and *Remains* of Antiquity which he has preserv'd: but, to see him insolently trampling on Great Names, is what I cannot bear without Indignation.

I need no Transition from hence to Dr Bentley; who, taking it now for granted, that *Æsop* did not write his Own Fables, will tell us, Who wrote 'em for him. *Demetrius Phalereus* he thinks to have been the first that committed them to Writing\*: And if Others should think that he was not the First, they would have somewhat better Ground for their Thought than He has; for, without insisting on the Passage

(b) *Leucon carries one thing, and his Als another.*

P. 74.

--something useful to a Liar besides a pretty Invention.

P. 17.

(c) *Dr Bentley has ventured to make use of these very Exploded Arguments of Athenæus, to discredit Socrates's Epistles; and ushers 'em in with this Glorious Character, Among other Errors in Chronology for which Athenæus chastises Plato. Diss.*

P. 93.

in

in *Plato*, they have *Aristophanes*, and his *Scholiast* (either of whose Words may be taken in this case, I hope, a little sooner than *Dr Bentley's*) to countenance their Opinion. *Aristophanes*, in the Passage mention'd by *Dr Bentley*, plainly intimates, that there was a Book of *Æsop's* Fables in *His* time; and *His* Time was before *Demetrius's*. Οὐδ' Αἰτωπον πεπότηκας, is, *ne Æsopum quidem legisti*: thus, the *Scholiast* interprets it; πεπότηκας ἀντὶ τοῦ ἀέγνου; thus the use of the word πεπότηκας in

other Authors || proves it ought to be translated; and, which is more than all, *Dr Bentley* himself has thus render'd it, *You have not read so much as Æsop*. How could *Æsop* be read at a time, when he supposes that there was no Collection of *Æsop's* Fables committed to writing? It happens indeed

|| *Plato*, in his *Phædrus*, has employ'd it just in this manner, ἀλλὰ μὴν τόν γε Τισίαν αὐτὸν πεπότηκας ἀκριβῶς p. 273. i. e. Tisiam ipsum accuratè trivisti, perlegisti. *Serranus* has mistaken the Sense of it, and translated it, Graviter persum dedisti.

now and then, that Books are written without being Read (Some of *Dr Bentley's* Works will be a Proof of this) but it can never happen, I presume, that any Book should be read, without being written. There is another Passage in *Aristophanes's* *Eisw'n*, where, speaking of the Eagle, he has these Words,

Ἐν πῶσιν Αἰσώπης λόγους ἐζηυρέθη  
Μόνον πτενῶν ἐς θεὸς ἀγίγμενον.

The Fable he refers to, is that of the Eagle and the Beetle, which is in the present Collection; and, I think, he manifestly quotes a Collection of Fables extant in *His* Time; I'm sure,

ſure, had he intended to quote ſuch a Collection, he could not have us'd Words that would more plainly have expreſs'd his Meaning. To return to my point therefore, if there was a *Written Æſop* in *Ariſtophanes's* time, then *Demetrius Phalereus* could not be the *First who committed Æſop's Fables to Writing*.

All the mention we have of this Performance of *Demetrius* is in *Lactius*, who ſays it was call'd *Ἀἰσώπειαι*, and *Ἀἰσώπειον Ἀγὸν Συνο-  
209αι*; by which, it ſeems to *Dr Bentley*, that they were in Proſe; and if it ſhould ſeem to anybody elſe, that they were in Verſe, they have juſt as much Reaſon for their Fancy, as he has: unleſs by his Divining Faculty, he can, from the Titles being in Proſe, ſmell out that the Work was ſo. Some, he ſays, may imagine, that they are the Same that are now extant: Some! who? not *Meziriac* I hope, becauſe he has not ſeen him. But, whoever theſe ſome be, *Dr Bentley* is againſt 'em. I wiſh (ſays he) they were [the ſame that are now extant] for then they would be well writ, with ſome Genius and Spirit (a). How are we to take him? Would *Demetrius's* Fables have been better than they were, if they had been ſtill extant? or would the Fables that are extant, and by ſome aſcrib'd to *Demetrius*, be better than they are, if *Demetrius* had wrote 'em? Had *Dr Bentley* wiſh'd that *Demetrius's* Fables were ſtill extant, it had been a Kind Wiſh; becauſe *Demetrius* is thought a better Writer than He that compos'd theſe Fables: but to wiſh *Demetrius's* the ſame that are now extant, is to wiſh his Fables no better written, nor with more Genius or Spirit, than thoſe we have.

R

Whom

Whom have we now after *Demetrius*? why, *Some-body*, that wrote the *Μυθικά*. and might, for ought any-body knows, be before him. For *Suidas*, the only Man the Dr finds that mentions these *Μυθικά*, giving no Intimation of the Author's Age, we are utterly at a loss where to fix him; unless Dr *Bentley* can help us out here, and by looking into his Mouth tell us of what Age his Greek is. Probably he was of no One Age; the *Μῦθοι* or *Μυθικά* in Verse, like our Present Collection in Prose, were, 'tis natural to think, made up from several Authors that wrote in several Times; amongst which *Babrius* himself (the next Au-

thor he mentions) might have but a Share, tho' a very large one (b): for we find him often quoted together with, and as it were under the Common Title of *Μῦθοι* or *Μυθικά* (c); and, by the bye, not to *Scazons* only, but *Hexameters* too (†); which, if it were a Mistake of *Suidas*,

might probably arise from his finding him mix'd with the Other Writers of the *Μυθικά*: but I am very unwilling to think it a Mistake, because the Verses are fine ones, and worthy of *Babrius*. Whether this Guess of mine be right or no, 'tis somewhat better founded than the Drs, who judges these *μυθικά* to

(b) Βιβλία δέκα, says *Suidas*.

(c) Βάβριος μύθος ἦτοι μυθικά *Suidas* in *σοφισμ.* Βάβριος ἐν τοῖς μυθικοῖς *Suidas* in *ἐννίκ.* Βαβρίας, μύθος ἦτοι μυθικά *Suidas* in *Βαβρίας*. Βάβριος ἐν Μυθικοῖς *Suidas* in *Νέμεσος*.

(†) Θέντο μετ' ἀλλήλοισιν ἱταρείην μύε δόϊω,  
Οὐ καλομά ζῶντες· ὁ μὲν χεῖρ νειδὼν ἐρήμῳ  
Ἐτρέφει, ὃς δὲ δόμοισιν ἐν ἀγνείῳ τρέφει ἀνδρῶν.  
*Suidas* in *ἱταρείην*.

to have been written all in *Elegiac Verse*, because he finds under this Title Two Pentameters quoted; and besides, in Three different Places, Three Hexameters, which might have no Pentameters after them; and (to strengthen his Inference yet farther) another Instance of Two Hexameters together. This the Reader will find to be a true State of the Case, if he will take the trouble of consulting the Paragraph, where this New Thought is in as New a Manner surprizingly well handl'd.

I had like here to have overlook'd One Considerable Branch of the Dr's Discovery, where he informs us, that these Fragments of the *Musick* belong to the *Æsopic Fables*, which, he says, has not yet been observ'd, that he knows of (a). I believe no body ever read these Fragments but observ'd it; however they kept their Observation to themselves, because they knew no-body could read 'em without observing it. For to what else could Fragments of Fables, written after the manner of *Æsop*, belong, but to the *Æsopic Fables*? which Title is known to comprehend not only the Fables suppos'd to have been written by *Æsop* himself; but all Others, fram'd after his Model.

The Reader remembers, that after *Demetrius* came *Some-body*, who might as well, for any thing we know of his Time, have come before him. Now after this *Some-body* comes *One Babrius* \*, who has the advantage indeed of our Last Author in having a Name, and no otherwise: for his Time is equally a Secret to us. *Aviennus*, 'tis true, by the Order he has plac'd him in, seems to think he was before

(a) Differ.  
p. 236.

\* Differ.  
p. 140.

*Phadrus*; but how little, or how long before, no body can determin. So that this *Babrius*, that liv'd we don't know When, comes after an Author, we don't know Who, and equally living we don't know When.

The Chronology of *Babrius* being thus settl'd, the Dr proceeds to his Character; and says, he was a *Writer of Size and Quality*: I agree with him in his Meaning, tho' his Wording of it be a little Particular. *Babrius* was indeed, as far as we can guess by the Small Remains we have of him, a very valuable Author, and deserv'd to have liv'd as well as *Phadrus* himself: He has not been lost so long as *Phadrus* was; may he be recover'd as entire! His Draughts are all Natural, his Expression Lively, and his Turn of Verse Numerous and Proper. But the Dr has by no means done right to his Character in the Instances he has given us to Judge him by; which are cited imperfectly Both, and the Last of 'em extreamly to his disadvantage. The First, about the *Sick Lyon*, which the Dr has thus quoted,

——— διὰ πρ νύσσῳ  
Κάμων ἐβίβλητ', ἐκ ἀληθὲς ἀδμαίων

he may please thus to supply,

Οἱκοὶ ἔσω ἀνάλυγθ' (\*) οἶα πρ νύσσῳ  
Κάμων ἐβίβλητ' &c.

To the next, φρίζας ὃ χαίτωνέκθερε φυλάδθ' κοίλης,  
He may add these Two Beautiful Verses,

Κοι-

---

(\*) Suidas, in ἀνάλυγθ', where κοίανω is, I suppose, a Corruption of οἱκοὶ ἔσω.

Κοιμώμενος Λέοντος, ἀρχὴς χαίτης  
 ▲ ἐδραμε (+) μὺς ὃ δὲ Λέων ἐθυμάθη\*  
 Φρίξας δὲ χαίτων, &c. *Suid in περιότρεισιν*

and this (to his Eternal Scandal be it spoken) is a Plain Proof that he has not read over all *Suidas*. Nay, I have reason to suspect, that he is got no further than Καίτα; which I observe here to be the utmost Line of his Citations. I would not have the Reader slight this Discovery of mine; for 'tis as considerable as any of Dr *Bentley's*, that are purely his own.

To oblige our Critic, who is so fond of New Hints, I will suggest One to him, that he may, if he pleases, improve at his Leisure. In the *Scholia* on *Thucydides* (p. 266.) there is a Passage quoted, ἐκ τῆς τῆς Αἰτάτης μύθων; and the words of it are,

— ἄλλος ἄλλον ἀρξέει χαίτων  
 Τρέχει περ ἄλλος ἄλλον ἐκ τῆς αὐτῆς πύλων.

Now here's a New Author for Dr *Bentley*, one that writ Fables alternately in Scazons and Iambicks; or here's a Proof at least that *Babrius* (whose Verses these seem to be) did not write all his Fables in Scazons admix'd: which may also be further confirm'd from this passage in *Suidas* \*, quoted by him out of *Babrius*, ἐκ ἀνθρώπων ἐδόξαν ἰδῆναι, ἀλλὰ δαίμονες τελαμῶναι λαμπραῖς πνέει; for it runs naturally into these Verses,

— ἐκ ἐδόξαν ἀνθρώπων  
 \* Εἶν', ἀλλὰ δαίμονες τελαμῶναι πνέει.

R 3

I sug-

(+) The strict Measure of the Verse requires that it should be διέδρα-  
 μαν. But the Painting is more Lively, according to the Present  
 Numbers.



I suggest this Thought to the Dr to enrich his Dissertation with, when he puts it into Latin. After he has done so, Some-body perhaps may shew him, that 'tis founded on a Mistaken Reading of those two Passages; but till then, I shall leave 'em as I found 'em.

After these Light Skirmishes, Dr Bentley comes at last to his Main Point; pretty early, I thank him: for he is not yet got quite Half way in his Remarks (that should be) upon *Æsop*. He now draws all his Forces against the Present Sett; and his arguments, I find, (making allowance for a few Stragglers, which I shall fetch into their Ranks) march in this Order. First he attempts to prove That Parcel of the Present Sett which *Nevelet* put out, to be younger than *Æsop* (a); in the next place, that it is even *recenter* than *Babrius* (b): and lastly, that the Other Parcel of 'em, which he ascribes to *Planudes*, is yet Younger than *Nevelet's* (a).

(a) §. VI.

(b) §. VII.

(c) §. VIII.

Upon the First Article he performs very notably; he is to detect the whole CXXXVI to be Spurious: Now would I willingly Compound for the Odd XXXVI (if our Critick will give me leave to call an Even Number so); but how Many do You think he has disproy'd? No less than *One*! and here endeth this Argument.

Not being able to proceed any farther here, he draws back, and falls once again upon his First Preliminary, that *Æsop* wrote no Fables; which, having now waded deep in the Controversie, he clearly perceives, because the CXCIId is told by *Aristotle* differently from what it is in *Æsop*, and in *Lucian* differently from

from what it is in *Aristotle*. Now here's a Long Chain of desperate Consequences; for if Dr *Bentley* has prov'd any thing, he has prov'd Ten times more than he is aware of. If *Æsop* did not write this Fable, because *Aristotle* gives different Circumstances of it; then neither did *Aristotle* write it, because *Lucian's* Account of it is as different from His, as His is from *Æsop's*. Nay, according to Dr *Bentley*, neither has *Lucian* told this Fable, tho' we find it in his Works; because it is otherwise told in our present Sett, which the Dr supposes written by a Man more Modern than He. All that can be gather'd from the Little Varieties in the same Fable, is, that they who had occasion to tell it, went no further than their Memory for it, where the Main of the Fable, and as much as was for their purpose, lay. And as for the Nice Circumstances of it, they either mistook 'em by accident, or thought they could vary 'em for the better.

This Digression has kindly supply'd the Room of his First Attempt; in the next, he endeavours at something that is really to his Purpose; and if his Proof were *Full*, and were his own, I, for my part, should thank him for the Discovery: but as it is neither, I shall take the liberty to shew both That and Him in their Proper Colours, and to do Justice to the Dead whom he has pillag'd.

His Pretence, and his Words are, that the Author of the Parcel which was publish'd by Nevelletus did nothing else but Epitomize Babrius, and put him into Prose (a). Granting he didn't, (a) Differ. whom are we to thank for this thought? p. 143.

(a) Ibid.  
r. 142.

Dr Bentley says, Himself; for He discover'd it (a). But there's an Honest Editor of the Dr's Acquaintance, a Man of a Fair Character, and who has not yet been convicted of any Trick, that puts in for the Discovery: let us hear what he says, and what the Dr can answer to it.

*Nevelet.* A Discovery, at this time of day! why, I found it out *Fourscore* Years ago, and publish'd it to all the World in my Edition of *Æsop*.

Dr Bentley. What care I for Your Edition? I found it out my self.

*New.* Not care for my Edition! You constantly referr to'r, and make use on't, and quote my Preface (b): doesn't all your Dispute turn upon *Nevelet's* Parcel? how can You pretend Ignorance?

*Bent.* I pretend to publish *such Things only as have escap'd the Observation of others*; I have done so, and I'll stand to't.

*New.* Stand to what You will, 'tis My Observation, and I'll unmask You. Have not I said, after quoting a *Scazon* out of the *Prose-Fables*, *Redolent hæc ut plurima alia harum Fabularum Versus Iambicos: atq; utinam exstarent hi Versus, unde hæc desumpta sunt; Babrium ipsum, quantum video, Integrum haberemus, cujus jam Umbram tantum & Epitomen habemus* (c). What have You said more than this comes to?

(c) Not in  
Fab. 157.

*Bent.* Yes; I don't call 'em, as You do, barely *Iambicks*, I call 'em *Choliambicks*, and *Scazons*: besides, You speak doubtfully, *redolent hæc, ut plurima alia, Versus Iambicos*: but I speak positively; My Expressions are, *There are most Visible*

*fible Footsteps, This is a manifest turning out of Choliambicks; Who doesn't discover here a Scazon?*

*Nev.* You have indeed a Peculiar Way of Speaking; but what else have You added to my Discovery, besides Confidence? You endeavour what You can to disguise what You take from me; but after all, there appears upon you here and there *not only a Sameness of Sense, but a Sameness of Words too, which could not fall out by Accident* \* : and this is Your \* Dissert. Own Way of tracing a Plagiary, The most <sup>p. 37.</sup> Remarkable Hint of mine, *Cujus jam EPITOMEN habemus*, don't you translate it literally, and say, that the Author of that Parcel did nothing but *EPITOMIZE Babrius*?

*Bent.* I don't go upon Hints; I have demonstrated, 'tis my Thought, by shewing the very manner in which I found it out. *I discover'd it by this means; I observ'd in 'em several Passages, that were not of a Piece with the rest, but had a Turn and Composition plainly Poetical, as in the CCLXIII<sup>d</sup> Fable, which begins thus* *Ὀντ πατήρας χάλοπα χαλδῆς ἐτύκει.* *This I saw was a Choliambic Verse (a).* (a) Dissert.

*Nev.* I know where you saw it; 'twas in <sup>p. 143.</sup> my Notes upon this Fable, where I have these Words, *Ὀντ πατήρας χάλοπα, &c. Versus Iambicus Scazon* —

*Bent.* But I improve upon this, and say — I presently suspected that the Writer had taken this out of Babrius.

*Nev.* That's the very Translation of my Words, that follow, — *Quales Babrius scripsit, nec satis scio num Babriæ ipsius.* Now, suppose You

(b) Fab.  
ECLXIII

You had observ'd several Footsteps of Scazons in the Fables, is it credible that You should take Your First Hint from that very Fable I did, which comes so Late in the Book (b); when the same Hint might as well have been taken from several Fables before it? Come, come, Dr, this bears hard upon You; the Footsteps of *Babrius* are not near so plain in the Fables, as the Footsteps of my Notes are in Your Remarks.

*Bent.* I tread in No man's Footsteps; 'tis well known, I have declar'd loudly against *Filching*; do you think I'd turn *Filcher* my Self? *Foreign Professors* know me better.

*New.* *Vizzanius*, and I, know You better than They do; and the World in a little time shall know You as Well as We do. You thought You might safely injure the Dead; but the Living shall do us right upon You, strip You of all Your borrow'd Plumes, and return 'em to their several Owners: You may read Your Fate out of these Verses of *Virgil*.

*His Bentejus ovat Spoliis, gaudetq; potitus.  
Nescia Mens hominum Fati, Sortisq; futura;  
Et servare modum rebus sublata secundis!  
Illi tempus erit, magno cum optaverit emptum  
Intactum Neveletum, & cum Spolia ista, diemq;  
Oderit——*

The Case between *Nevelet* and Dr Bentley is fairly represented in this Dialogue; and if any-body still thinks that the Dr struck out this Hint purely by his own *Sagacity*, I'm sure, I shall take no further pains to convince him; but go on to examine, how far the Discovery reaches.

Dr

Dr Bentley has instanc'd in Six Several Fables, in which he finds the Traces of *Babrius's* Scazons. In the Two First he has pretty good Colour for what he says; because *Suidas* has preserv'd Three Scazons of *Babrius*, the Words of which are most of 'em to be found in these Two Fables, and very near in the same Order. In the Four next he does not go upon so good Grounds; but indulges his Fancy, without having the Authority of *Suidas* to back him in it. He finds out some Words that will run into Scazons, or Pieces of Scazons; and, without any more ado, concludes from thence, that These were design'd for Scazons, and those Scazons were *Babrius's*. That the Two first of the Four have something of a Poetical Turn I agree with him; particularly the Conclusion of the Second, methinks, is Noble, and not unbecoming *Babrius*.

——— φαῖνε, Λύχρε, καὶ σῖγα·

Τῶν ἀείρων τὸ φέξι' ἔποι' ἐκλήπει·

The Rest are so Flat, and so Unmusical, that I can scarce ever think 'em design'd for Verses; or if they were, yet I have too great a Regard for *Babrius*, to think 'em His. Others beside *Babrius* might happen to turn a Fable the same way; Dr Bentley ought to know, that *Callimachus* did so. As for One of 'em, the CLXV<sup>th</sup>, Dr Bentley very unluckily pitches upon it, to prove it transpos'd from *Babrius*. It begins in the Prose, Ἄνθρωπος μεσοπλίδος δύο ἐρασμένους ἔχων, ὃν μὲν μία νεάνις, ἢ ἄλλη πρεσβύτερα, which the Dr supposes to have been in *Babrius*, thus,

Ἄνθρωπος μεσοπλίδος δύο ἐρασμένους ἔχων,  
ἢ ἢ μὲν ἢ νεάνις, ἢ δὲ πρεσβύτερα.

A Good

A Good Judge of these things easily perceives, that the First of these Verses has nothing Harmonious in the Numbers, or Poetical in the Expression of it; and would conclude therefore that this Fable was not taken from *Babrius's* Scazons, tho' he had no other Evidence of it. But it happens, that Two Verses, truly *Babrius's*, and relating to this Fable, are preserv'd in *Suidas*, which utterly overthrow Dr *Bentley's* Criticism; for the Wording of 'em does not in the least fall in with That of the Prose. The Verses are,

(a) *Suid.*  
in ἐκάστῃ  
(b) *Ibn*  
Last is a  
Corrupt  
Reading.

(a) τῶν ἑν τριῶν ἐκάστῃ ἢ μὲν ἀλμαία  
ἔτεμεν ἄς εὗρισκε λευκανθίσους (b).

If the Prose Fable had trac'd *Babrius* so nearly in the beginning, it would have carried some Resemblance to him throughout; and therefore in *One* of his *Six* Dr *Bentley* is Evidently mistaken; and must guess again, before he can make up his Number.

In the mean time I desire the Reader to take notice, that there are in *Suidas* Fragments of *Babrius* belonging to above Twenty Several Fables; and out of all these Dr *Bentley* has been able to produce but Two that have the least Agreement with our Prose Sett: the Rest are widely different in their Expression, as appears by comparing 'em with the particular Fables to which they belong; which in most Cases may be done with Certainty. Nay, we have one entire Fable of *Babrius*, about the *Swallow* and *Nightingale*, and another large Fragment of *Nine Lines*, about the *Priests of Cybele*; and the Fables that answer to these in the Prose are now extant; and are so far from

from resembling *Babrius's* Verses, that they have scarce a Word the same with 'em. With what Face therefore could Dr *Bentley* pronounce it *Evidently apparent*, that the Author of these Prose Fables did nothing else but Epitomize *Babrius* \*? 'Twould be full as good a \* P. 143. Consequence, should one say; because we find, that Two or Three Fragments of *Ennius*, are with some little difference plainly inserted into *Virgil's* *Æneid*; therefore 'tis Evident, that *Virgil* did nothing else but transcribe *Ennius*.

After Dr *Bentley's* way of Arguing, I could easily prove, that all *Nevelet's* parcel is transposed, or (as he would call it) *translated*, not † P. 147. from Old *Babrius's* Scazons, but the Modern *Gabrius's* Iambicks. " That they are more " Recent than *Gabrius*, I discover'd by this " means, I observ'd in 'em some Passages that " had a Poetical Turn, as in the 173d Fable,

Ὁυτος κακῶς πύκτι τὸς εὐεργέτας.

" This I saw was an Iambick Verse; and (having first seen it observ'd in *Nevelet's* Note upon this Fable) I presently suspected that " it was taken from *Gabrius*, and was soon " confirm'd in my Judgment: for upon consulting his Version of the Fable, I found " this Verse there. Whence it Evidently appears, that the Author of this Parcel did " nothing else but enlarge upon this Sorry " Poet, and put him into Prose. I could go on producing Other Instances of the kind, which would make out the Point about *Gabrius* much more clearly and plainly than Dr *Bentley* has made out His about *Babrius*, but I have a greater regard for my Own; and  
for



for my Reader's Time, than to throw it away upon such Trifles.

'Tis so far from being a Mark of Acuteness to point out a few Scazons or Iambicks in the Compass of a Book, that, on the contrary, 'tis hard to find a page of Greek Prose any where without 'em. *Aristotle* has long ago observ'd for the Greek, and *Tully* for the Latin, that those Languages run naturally into this Sort of Metre; and that 'tis difficult even in Com-

mon Discourse to avoid it (a).

Nay, to show how little can be made of such Conjectures as These; I dare undertake to find in these Fables any Sort of Verse that *Dr Bentley* shall pitch upon; and many more Verses of some Sorts, than the Dr has produc'd Scazons. I will give him an Instance or two of this kind, to show how very fanciful 'tis possible for a man to be in these matters, with how very small Grounds.

The Fable of *the Fly*, in the Greek Prose runs thus, Μυῖα ἐμπόσπαι εἰς χύτρον κρίματος, ἐπειδὴ ὑποπνίγεσθαι ἐμενεν, ἐξήντη πρὸς ἑαυτὸν· ἀλλ' ἔγωγε καὶ βέβρωκα, καὶ πέπωκα, καὶ λέλωμαι, καὶ ἔσθω θανάτῳ, εἰδὲν μέλει μοι. Now 'tis the Easiest thing in the World to resolve these Words into *Hemi-iamb*s, or *Anacreonticks*, with some Slight Allowances in the Measure.

Μυῖ' ἐμπόσπαι εἰς χύτρον  
..... ἐπειδὴ  
'Υποπνίγεσθ' ἔμελλεν,  
.....

*ἔγωγε*

(a) Μάλιστα πάντων ἥδ' ἡμέτρων Ἰαμβεῖα φθίγοντο λέγοντες. *Arist. Rhet.* l. 3. c. 8.

Andagen — ἡμέλις γὰρ λεκτικὸν τῶν μέτρων τὸ ἰαμβεῖον ὅτι σημειῖον δὲ τὸ τοῦ, πλεῖστα γὰρ ἰαμβεῖα λέγουμεν ἐν τῇ κοινῇ διαλέκτῳ πρὸς ἀλλήλους. *Poet. L.* i. C. 3.

Senarios & Hipponacteos (i. e. *Iambicks and Scazons*) effugere vix possumus; magnam enim partem ex Iambis nostra constat Oratio.

*Cic. Orator.*

Ἐγὼ μὲν βέβρωκα,  
Πέπωκα, καὶ λέλυμαι·  
Θαυεῖν ἐδὲν μέλει μοι·

And this Conjecture, I might say, is so much the more probable; because not only the Numbers, but even the Humor and Matter of the Fable is Anacreontical.

Agēn, in the Fable of the *Nightingale and the Hawk*, we have these Trochaicks,

Ἄλλ' ἔργον ἄρρων ἄν εἴλω,  
Εἰ τερπνὸν ἐς χερσὶ ἐτοίμω, &c.

In the Conclusion of the Fable of the *Frogs*, we have these Words,

— ἀν δὲ  
Ἵδωρ ξηρανθῆ, πῶς ἀναβησόμεθα ;

Who doesn't see that this Fable was written in Long and Short Verses ?

That of the *Lover and his Two Mistresses* is told twice in the Present Collection ; in the Parcel printed before *Nevelet* thus, Ἀνὴρ πρὸς μέσῳ ἔχων ὕβριν δύο ἔχεν ἐταίρας, μίαν μὲν γεραίῃ, τὴν δὲ ἰπτεῖαν νέαν· τὴν γὰρ ῥηῖς τὰς μέλανας τρίχας ἐπύλλειν, ὥς χροῖα τῆτον θέλει· ἡ δὲ νέα τὸς πλείους, ὥς ἀνὰ πὺν φαλακρὸν ἐπὶ ἡνὶ καὶ ὄνειδος ἀπάντων· Now the greatest part of this will run naturally into Long and Short Verse,

Ἀνὴρ πρὸς . . . . . δύο ἔχεν ἐταίρας,  
[Τινὶ] μίαν μὲν γεραίῃ, τὴν δὲ ἰπτεῖαν νέαν·  
Τούτῳ δ' ἡ μὲν ῥηῖς μέλανας τρίχας [αἰὲν] ἐπύλλειν  
[Ἐκ κεφαλῆς, αὐτὴς δ'] ἡ νέα τὰς πολέους·  
. . . . . αὐτὸν φαλακρὸν, καὶ ὄνειδος ἀπάντων.

But

BUT notwithstanding these near Resemblances of several Sorts of Verse, that are to be met with in our Prose Fables, I am far from thinking that the Fables in which they are found were written first in Anacreontic, Trochaic, or Elegiac Measure, and from thence made Prose; and should any one pretend to prove it from hence, they would engage I think in a Ridiculous Attempt. The Composers of these Fables might accidentally so range their Words as to fall into these Measures, the Best and the Worst Writers often do so, without being aware of it: In Sir William Temple's and Dr Bentley's English, how many *Blank Verses* are there, which they themselves never thought of, or intended? and therefore nothing, I say, can be built upon such Vain and empty Conjectures.

However, so well satisfied is the Dr with his Performances of this kind, that he triumphantly concludes, *Thus have I prov'd One Half of the Fables that carry the Name of Æsop, to be a Thousand Years more Recent than He*†. His Proof, without any manner of Misrepresentation, or Ridicule, stands thus.

† Differ.  
p. 146.

“ If out of an 136 Fables, *Two*, by leaving  
 “ out Some, and putting in Other Words,  
 “ and changing the Order of 'em, look like  
 “ Two Fragments of *Babrius* preserv'd in *Suidas*, then 'tis Ev'dent that these were trans-  
 “ pros'd from *Babrius*: and if in *Four* more  
 “ there are some Resemblances of Scazons, of  
 “ which no Footsteps appear any where else,  
 “ then these also were transpros'd from Sca-  
 “ zons; and those Scazons must be *Babrius's*:  
 “ and if the Passages in these *Six* Fables are  
 “ bor-

" borrow'd from *Babrius*, then the whole  
 " Parcel of an 136 (among which these Six  
 " chance to be found) are certainly Later  
 " than *Babrius*: and if they are Later than  
 " *Babrius*, (whose Age we certainly know no  
 " more of than that he liv'd before *Avienus*)  
 " then they are certainly above a Thousand  
 " Years more Recent than *Æsop*.

Having by this Subtle Chain of Consequences drawn down the Date of Half the Fables a Thousand Years below *Æsop*, he goes on with the same Clearness and Strength of Reason to prove the Other Half more Modern than They. *That they are not from Æsop's Own Hand, we may know, he says, from the LXXth, of the Serpent and the Crabfish, which is taken from a Scholion, or Catch, much older than Æsop* (a). That this *Scholion* is older than *Æsop*, (a) *Differa*  
 he has, I believe, no manner of Authority to say; *p. 146.*  
*Athenaus*, who cites it, intimates nothing of the Age of it; and if it were Older than *Æsop*, might not *Æsop* take Occasion from it to raise a Fable of his Own? So that the Dr's Proof has these two small Defects, that the bottom on which he goes is a Precarious Assertion, and the Inference he draws from thence wild and unreasonable.

After this, he objects against a New *Beast*, and a New *Bird*, to be met with in our present Sett, which were utterly unknown to all the Ancient Naturalists. As to his *Beast*, *Baveuegn*, 'tis, I own, a New Sort of Monster; and so New, as not to be met with in the Elder MSS of *Æsop*, nor even in several of the Modern ones. *Vossius's MS*, and Two in the *Bodley-Libra*

Library, instead of βενύρω φειτουχόντες, read, βρώμα π' ἐυρέντες: this βρώμα π', 'tis likely, might be βῦν at first, (which may be observ'd throughout the Fables to be the Prey the Lyon generally feeds upon-†) and from the Confusion of those Two Words, βῦν and ἐυρέντες, our New Sort of Beast might easily arise.

† From hence the Epithet of

βῆφάρος Βῆφάρος εἰς κοιλίῳ ἀτρεπὲν ἵκασι λέων· Suidas in βῆφάρος

Perhaps too the Original of the word Βούταλις may be trac'd from the same heedlessness of a Transcriber. It might formerly have been \*Ουταλις, the same with \*Ορταλις, (as οὐτάλιχ⊙ is with ὀρτάλιχ⊙ \*) and the B, which stood there for the Number of the Fable, being joyn'd to the first word \*Ουταλις, might create this New Species of a Bird.

\*'Ορτάλιχοι, οἱ μὴ πῶ π' ὀνόματι τὸ μένος

νεοσάδαι, καὶ

οἱ ἀλεγκρυόνες, καὶ κρεμάσσει, Hesych. in 'Ορτάλιχοι: for which Nicander uses 'Ουτάλιχοι. If κρεμάσσει in Hesychius may be interpreted Aves Pensiles, Birds hung up in Cages, the Wording and Matter of the Fable will fall in very naturally with this Guess about \*Ουταλις; for it begins thus, Βούταλις ἀπὸ πνι⊙ θυρίδος ἐκρέματο—

But whether or no This be the way in which these Words crept into the Text, is not worth insisting upon; it seems plain to me that they sprung from some Corruption of it, since they are not to be met with, that I can find, in any other Author, Ancient or Modern, or in any Other Fable of *Æsop*, but these Two only. And if a Modern Corruption of any place in a Book prove the Book it self Modern, there is no Book but may be prov'd so.

Upon the same false Ground his next Objection about the *Hebraism* is built: instead of

of βωὴν ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ, *Vossius's* MSS reads, ἵστατο δὲ διανοοῦντο Dr *Bentley*, who pretends to such a *Sagacity in the way of Critic*, and talks as if he had consulted all the MSS of *Æſop* upon this occasion, should, methinks, have observ'd these Various Readings, and have had the Skill to make use of 'em.

There are yet Two Fables more in this Sett, which the Dr will prove not to be *Æſop's*, One, because he finds it word for word almost in *Aphthonius* (he means *Aphthonius*): and it may be *Aphthonius* found it word for word before in *Æſop*; and then we are as we were. The Other, he says, is a Paraphrase on the CCLXXXIVth in *Neveletus's* Parcel: and why may not that in *Nevelet* be as well an Abridgment of This?

Having laid down these Undeniable Premises, he solidly concludes thus; *This Collection THEREFORE is more Recent than that Other* †. † Dissert. Never was the poor Particle *therefore* so miserably abus'd; he has mention'd but Six Fables out of an *Hundred and fifty*, and has given us no tolerable proof that any One of those Six are Modern; and yet in the Strength of what he has done ventures to pronounce the Whole Sett to be so. Either Dr *Bentley* must be a very Thoughtless Writer, or he must hope to meet with very Thoughtless Readers: and such I am sure they must be, if these ways of arguing pass upon 'em.

What has Our Critic then been doing all this while? he pretends to prove, that the whole *Three hundred Fables* are at least a *Thousand Years Younger than Æſop*; he has attempt-

ed this Proof particularly but upon *Twelve* of

them ; and that in a very Weak Inconclusive manner. However, should I give him up these *Twelve*, and add *Two hundred* more to the account, and allow all these to have been Later than *Æsop* ; yet still there are Enow left to support Their Pretences, who make *Æsop* an Author, and take Some of these Fables to be Originals of His Composing. Nobody imagin'd that All, or Half the Fables, that have gone under the name of *Æsop*, are His ; or that Any of 'em almost are in the very same Words and Syllables that they were in, when they came out of His hands. They have doubtless undergone some more, some less Alterations : but if under all these Changes still the Same little Story in its chief Circumstances, and the same Simplicity in telling it ; the same Humorous Turn of Thought, and in good measure the same Words too have been preserv'd ; there is enough of *Æsop* left, whereby we may make a true Judgment of his Spirit and Genius, and manner of Performance. When *Dr Bentley* shall clearly have made out, either that None of these Fables came from *Æsop* himself ; or, if they did, yet that in the very Form and Cast of 'em, as well as the Expression, they have been since so totally alter'd, that they deserve not to be call'd the Same ; it will then be time enough to own, that we are unable to judge of *Æsop's* merit by any thing in the Present Collection : but till that is done, we may safely enjoy our Opinions, and They that have admir'd *Æsop*, may venture to go on, and admire him still.

All that Dr Bentley has hitherto offer'd upon the subject of *Æsop* is so slight and inconsiderable, that one would naturally imagine it to be his own, and believe him when he says, that he intended to give us nothing but what had escap'd the Observation of Others\*: \* Dissert. and yet 'tis certain that Nothing almost which he has said could escape the Observation of any man that look'd into *Nevelet*; in whose Preface, and Short Notes, the very same Remarks are made, without any thing of the Ostentation and Ill reasoning that here accompanies 'em. The Reader will know whether I have Injur'd Dr Bentley in this Imputation, after he has given himself the trouble of viewing the following Accounts, wherein I have compar'd *Nevelet's* Old Observations with Dr Bentley's New Ones.

Sect. I. Dr Bentley observes, that One in *Aristophanes* tells another, that he is unlearn'd and unacquainted with *Æsop*, ἐῖς

\* Αἰτωπὶν πεπαιγμένον

Sect. II. Socrates essay'd to put the *Æsopic Fables* into Verse.

Sect. V. Afterwards came one Babrius, that gave a New Turn to the Fables into Choliambic Verse. Suid. in βιβλίῳ.

Ibid. There's One *Gabrias* yet extant, that has compriz'd each

Unde est Aristophanicum Convitium, ἐῖς Ἀἰτωπὸν πεπαιγμένον.

Neve. Præf. p. 2.

Socrates *Æsopi Fabulas* dignas judicavit quas Versibus includeret. Id. ibid.

De *Gabria* iidem est ut moneam, scripsit Ille Iambico metro ejus generis quod est τῶν χαλκῶν τῶν, ut Suidas notat.

Præf. p. 4.

Injuria *Babriæ* sit cum ei Tetrasticha quæ vulgò exstant

S 3 ad



*each Fable in four Sorry Lambicks ; but our Babrias was an Author of another Size.*

Ibid. *There's a Noble Fa-  
ble of his yet preserv'd at the  
End of Gabrias, of the Swal-  
low and the Nightingale.*

Ibid. Suidas brings many Quotations out of him, as this, &c.

Sect. VI. Here Dr Bentley has the Ingenuity to own his acquaintance with *Nevelerns*, where he takes little or nothing out of him.

SECT. VII. That they are  
 recenter than even Babrius I  
 discover'd by this means; I  
 observ'd in 'em several Passa-  
 ges, that were not of a piece  
 with the rest, but had a Turn  
 and Composition plainly Poeti-  
 cal; as in the CCLXIII<sup>d</sup> Fa-  
 ble, which begins thus, *Ὅρος  
 παύει καὶ σκόλοπι χαλδὸς ἰσχυεῖ*  
 This I saw was a Choliambic  
 Verse, and I presently suspect-  
 ed that the Writer had taken  
 it from Babrius: whence it

*adscribuntur, quæ Babriam  
pro suis agnoscere pueret.*

Id. *ibid.*

At in τῆραςίχοις illis ne  
unicus quidam Scæzon præter-  
quam in ultimâ Fabulâ τῆ  
χειρὶδόν καὶ ἀνδρὶδόν; quæ so-  
la restat naufragii tabula.

Id. *ibid.*

*Ex pluribus Babriæ Fragmentis quæ extant apud Suidam, nonnulla congeram, &c.*  
and then he gives us 14 Verses of *Babrius*, collected from *Suidas*.

Nev. Not. ad Fab.  
CCLXXIII. Ὀνος πατισίας  
σχόλοπα χαλδὸς ἐστίναι. Versus  
Iambicus Scazon, quales Ba-  
brius scripsit, nec satis scio  
num Babrii ipsius. And-  
agen, Fab. CLXXV. Ἀσπὴν  
πατίσας ὁ ζωορὸς ἐποίησιν, &c.  
Redolent hæc, ut plurima alia  
harum fabularum loca, Versus  
Iambicus: atq; utinam extra-  
rent hi Versus, unde hæc de-  
sumpta sunt; Babriam ipsam,  
quantum video, integrum ha-  
beremus.

evidently appears that the Author of that Parcel did nothing else but EPITOMIZE Babrius, and put him into Prose.

Ibid. There's a Noble Fragment of Babrius belonging to the CCXLVth Fable about the Priests of Cybele, given us by Natalis Comes, Γάλλοις ἀγύρταις, &c.

beremus, cujus jam Umbram tantum & EPITOMEN habemus.

Egregie verò rem totam describit Babrius: quod Fragmentum debemus Natali Comiti; nullibi quippe quod sciam extat præterquam in ipsius Mythologiâ, Γάλλοις ἀγύρταις, &c. Not. in Fab. CCXLV.

I must stop a little here to commend the Dr for being so true to his Author always, as even to Copy his Mistakes. Nevelet did not know of any Writer before Natalis Comes, where this Fragment was to be met with; and therefore our Dissertator, that goes no further than Nevelet, could know no more than He did. However, he ought to have known somewhat more; because he pretends † to have read † Dissert. what Tzetzes says of Babrius. Had he done P. 140. as he pretends, he would have found Babrius mention'd in Tzetzes together with this very Fragment; and that in such a manner, that 'twas impossible to see the one, and yet overlook the other. For thus Tzetzes, in one of the Two Places where he speaks of Babrius, enters upon the mention of him \*,

\* Par. 475.

Ἀκρον ὃ Βαβρίῳ δὲ πρὸν χαλῶν ἱμῶν,  
Γάλλοις ἀγύρταις, &c.

Sect. VIII. There is no MS, above 300 Years Old, which

Ex MSS illis quos habui,  
ne unicus quidem vulgatus jam  
S 4 ha-

which has the Fables according to that Copy—Coming abroad first with Æsop's Life, writ by Planudes, they are justly believ'd to be owing to the same Writer.

Ibid. The LXXVth about the Æthiopian, is taken almost word for word out of the Vith of Aphthonius.

habuit Æsopi Fabulas, quas à Planude (ut Æsopi Vita est) scriptas existimo.

Nev. Præf.

Inter Æsopicas Fabulas legitur quoq; hac paucis immutatis sub Titulo Aithioi.

Nev. Not. in Fab. VI. Aphthon.

Thus far I have had leisure to trace the Dr in *Nevelet*; and I need trace him no farther; for These Hints, which appear to be taken from thence are the only ones that he pretends to build any thing upon. Whatever he has added of his own (if he has added any thing) has been already shewn to be either a Mistake, or nothing to his Purpose. And now let me put a Grave Question to him; with what Modesty, or Conscience, he could tell his Reader, at the Entrance of this Dissertation, that he intended to offer such things only, as had escap'd the Observation of Others? when 'tis manifest, that, as far as we have hitherto gone in his Remarks (that is in Three Quarters of 'em) he has done nothing but plunder'd *Nevelet*. 'Tis true, as he wittily observes †, *Good Wits jump* sometimes: however I should think it a pretty Nice matter for the Best Wits in the World to jump so often together, so very evenly!

† Differ.  
p. 33.

What he has put together in the next Paragraph, concerning the Life and Manners of Æsop,

Æsop, with a great Shew of Reading, was already collected to his hand out of *Enstathius*, *Plutarch*, *Agathias*, *Philostatus*, *Pliny*, *Herodotus*, *Suidas* and *Strabo*; and the Passages from thence printed at large in the End of *Camærius's* Fables. Dr *Bentley* presents these to us with the same Pomp and Pleasure, as if he had been the first Producer of 'em; and makes no addition to their Number, but by One Poor Quotation out of the Scholiast on *Aristophanes*, and another known passage of *Phædrus*.

When he was mentioning (a) *Meziriac*, (a) *Dissol.*  
*Vavasor*, and *Bayle*, as Men that had gone before him on this Subject, it would have been honourably done of him, not to have forgotten Those, whom he was so much more beholden to, *Nevelet*, and *Camærius*. But I find he's ashamed of his Nearest Acquaintances; and, after such Instances of his Ingenuity, I believe his Nearest Acquaintances will be ashamed of Him.

Our Critic having spent his Small Artillery here and there upon a Fable, without much Success, grows Peevish, and is resolved to be reveng'd on the Poor Monk that Collected 'em, *Planudes*; who, as much a Monk as he was, never, I believe, gave any man such Course Language from his Cell, as he now receives from Court. He is call'd here an *Idiot of a Monk*, that has given us a Book [the Life of Æsop] which perhaps cannot be match'd in any Language for Ignorance and Nonsense (b). As (b) *Ibid.*  
for *Planudes* himself, I must confess, I have not P. 147.  
the Deepest Veneration for his Character;  
but

but neither can I think so despicably of him, as the Lofty Dr Bentley does, because I find him well spoken of by men of Good Knowledge and Judgment, and even by his Adver-

saries Themselves (a). Nay, Dr Bentley, I think, gives an account of him, not at all to his disadvantage, where he says, that That Sett of Fables he put out was of his own drawing up; amongst which, there are several so well turn'd, so exactly copied from Nature, and built on such a true knowledge of Humane Life and Affairs, that 'tis plain he was neither an *Ideot*, nor a *Monk*, that compos'd 'em. This is an Honour therefore misplac'd on *Planudes*, and which he deserves as little as he does that Scurri- lous Language, which the Dr (ever happy in Inconsistencies) has in that very Page bestow'd upon him. *Nevelet* and *Va- vasor* were a little too hasty in their Conclusions on this matter, and spake too large- ly, when from some Fables that relish'd of *Planudes's* Style and Way, they inferr'd that All were of His Compo-

sing. Dr Bentley has taken up the same In- ference from an argument of as little weight :  
the

(a) The Learned Cardinal *Bessiris*, in a Treatise he wrote against *Planudes* long after his Death, has this Ap- postrophe to him, 'Ου ποὺ ἀν- εγὰρ σε ἀνδρῶν ἀρίστου καὶ πεφώ- τατος, καὶ σοφίου ἕτα παρ' ἐξ η- σχημένους παιδείαν, ἔπος δὲ δια- βιβηκότου ἐν φιλοσοφίᾳ καὶ θεωρίᾳ, καὶ διὰ πάντων μὲν μαθημάτων ὁδούσαντος, ἐν- δοκίμουσαντος δὲ ἐν ἀποσιν &c. *Opusc. Aurea*, p. 622. *Arcudius*, the Collector of these Pieces, and who differs as much in his Sentiments from *Planudes*, as *Bessiris* does, has in his Preface, this Honourable Character of him: *Planudem, Monachum Græcum, celeberrimum Philo- sophum, & Theologum, & in utraq; Linguâ versatissimum*. And the Epithet *Σοφώτατος* which *Bessiris* bestows upon him, is given him also in the Titles of his Manuscript Pie- ces, Τῆ Σοφωτάτου ἀνδρός Μάξι τῆ Πλαν. &c.---which shews, that tho' *Planudes* was a *Monk*, yet the Scholars of those Times were far from thinking him an *Ideot*.

the Reason (and the only Reason he gives) for his believing 'em drawn up by *Planudes*, is, that *there is no MS any where above 300 Years old, that has the Fables according to that Copy. No MS ! any where !*

Very Extensive Words ; 'tis pretty difficult to answer for All the Libraries of *Europe* : for, as a late Critic observes-†, *Learned Men are often debarred the Use of MSS, either by their Distance from 'em, or by the Envious Temper of those that*

*have the Custody of 'em ; or by some Other Sort of Hindrances* — as for Example, when they expect to have those kind of Favours gratuitously done 'em. But supposing he had an Exact Account of All the *European* MSS, yet how does he know, but that there may be one at *Fez* ? the most inaccessible Library in the World, next to that at *St James's*.

This was an Assertion fit to be laid down by *Dr Bentley*, because impossible to be prov'd, and, I believe, not difficult to be disprov'd : for, as much out of the way of those things as I live, I have casually heard of a MS, Older than *Planudes*, that has the Fables according to His Copy : *Vossius's* MS I mean, which tho' I have not seen my self, yet better Judges than I am, who have seen it, assure me, that it is about 500 Years Old, and that *Vossius* himself always esteem'd it so. 'Tis now at *Leyden*, I think ; and might have been nearer, but for Some-body's management. I need look out for no more Instances; against a Negative, One  
is

† Sæpe non licet Viris doctis MSS adire, seu ob Distantiam Locorum, seu ob Præsectorum Bibliothecis invidiam, seu ob alia Impedimenta quæ memorare nihil attigit. *Ars Crit.* p. 172.

is as good as a Thousand. If all the MSS, that have the Fables according to *Planudes's* Copy were evidently Younger than He, yet we could not from thence certainly collect, that He was the Author of those Fables: whereas if One of the MSS happens to be Older than He, we may be pretty sure he was not.

\* Differ.  
p. 247.

As for *Planudes's* Life of *Æsop*, I can't indeed think it a Book *not to be march'd in any Language for Ignorance and Nonsense* \*, because in Some Languages I think it may: however, I have no great Opinion of it. There are in it Several Idle Trifling Stories, told in such a Fabulous Way, that one would think *Planudes* meant to suit the Life to the Book which follows; and writ out of his Own Invention for want of Authorities. And yet neither dare I reject every Circumstance of his Account as fictitious, that I do not find confirm'd by Elder Authors: he might make use of Books that never came down to us; a great deal of Good History perish'd in the sacking of *Constantinople*: or he might from the Same Books which we have now in our hands, take some Hints, which we have not yet observ'd in 'em; and which it would be very Rash and Immodest in Us to pronounce not to be there, till we have read over all the Greek Authors carefully, and sifted 'em thoroughly. And this is particularly fit to be said to Dr Bentley, who, for want of such a Prudent Distrust of his own Knowledge, has been Guilty of a Gross Mistake. The Circumstance in *Planudes's* Account, which he pitches upon to expose, is that of *Æsop's Ugliness*. He had met with a  
Large

Large Collection of Testimonies concerning Æsop in *Camerarius's* Fables ; in none of which there was any Hint of his Deformity : and he concluded therefore, that there must, and could be none any where else ; and that This was certainly a Fiction of *Planudes*. And now how does he insult the poor *Ignorant Monk* \* on this occasion ? how unmercifully (b) Differ. does he use him ? he asks him, *what Revelation* P. 149. *he had about Æsop's Deformity ? for he must needs learn it, he says, by Dream and Vision, and not by Ordinary Methods of Knowledge. He liv'd about Two Thousand Years after Æsop ; and in ALL that Tract of TIME there's not ONE SINGLE Author, that has given the LEAST HINT that Æsop was Ugly* †. *Isaac Casaubon*, † *Ibid.* or *Gerhard Vossius*, who had either of 'em read Ten times as much as *Dr Bentley*, would not have talk'd at this rate ; because Neither of 'em, as Learned as They were, had read All that was written, or remember'd all they had read. But *Dr Bentley*, in the strength of *Camerarius's* Collections, is positive that not ONE SINGLE Author before *Planudes's* time, has given the LEAST HINT of Æsop's Ugliness. If he would not be Angry, I would venture, out of my small Stock of Reading to supply him with One, and Him an Author of great Note, *Eusebius* ; who in the beginning of his Comment on the *Odysses* (p. 17.) derives the word *Ἀισώπος* from *αἰθω, αἰω, τὸ λάμπω*, and *ωψ. ἐξέ*, says he, *Ἀισώπος ἀνθρωπίνως*. I contend not for the Goodness of the Etymology, let it shift for it self : but it is evidently built on a Supposition that Æsop was Ugly ;  
and



and implies, that That Opinion was Common in *Eustathius's* time, that is, about *Two hundred Years* before *Planudes* was born. Doubtless, that Learned *Parecholiſt* (to speak in *Dr Bentley's* Phrase) could have produc'd Authorities enough for this Opinion, tho' they are since lost: however He himself is a sufficient Authority to Us in the point, since he is not, as far as I can find, expressly contradicted in it by any One Ancient Writer; at least, he must be allow'd to screen *Planudes* from the Imputation of having invented this Particular to the Dishonour of *Æſop*: which he was so far from doing, that we have reason to think he might have this very Passage of *Eustathius* in his Eye, where he tells us, that *Ἀἰσωπος* and *Ἀἰθίοψ* are

the same (a), and that *Æſop* took his Name from his Uglinefs. The Ground-work of this Story then *Planudes* had either from *Eustathius*, or from some Elder Account, which both *Eustathius* and He equally transcrib'd; and upon this Ground-work it is probable he enlarg'd, in his Fanciful Way; and being satisfied that *Æſop* was Ugly in the main, was resolv'd to make him as

Ugly as he could possibly, and to dress up a Monster in all imaginable Kinds of Deformity.

Whether there be any Author, besides *Eustathius*, extant, who has made express mention of *Æſop's* Uglinefs, I am not now at leisure to enquire: sure I am, there are in other

Wri-

(a) *Πρόχειλος, μέλας, ὅθεν καὶ τὴν ὀνόμαϊς ἔπνευχε τὸ αὐτὸν καὶ Ἀἰσωπος καὶ τὴν Ἀἰθίοπι.* Vit. *Æſ.* in initio. *Planudes* here intimates the same Derivation of *Ἀἰσωπος* with *Eustathius*, that is, as to the Words themselves, from whence it comes, tho' he takes *Ἀἰθίοψ* in the Sense of Uro, and not of Splendeo; which he thinks the Easier Etymology, as needing no Antiphrasis to justify it.

Writers Remote Hints and Intimations of this Matter, such as may fairly be suppos'd to imply it. When, in *Plutarch's* Feast, one of the Guests thus rallies Æsop, καὶ τῶν βραδύς, καὶ ἡμίονον τρέχεις, he seems to reflect upon his Ill-shape and Unweildiness. *Lucian*, in his *Vera Historia* says, they us'd Æsop in the *Fortunate Islands* for a Γελοτοποιὶς, a Buffoon, or Jester, one that made c'm Sport (a); meaning I suppose that he did it as well by his Person and Outside, as by his Ingenious and Divertive Fa-

(a) Παρὼ καὶ Αἰτωπῶ  
Φρύξ· τέτρω δέδου καὶ Γελο-  
τοποιῶ χρών. P. 397.

bles; and indeed rather by the First than the Latter, for his Fables of themselves, tho' they entertain and please us extreamly, yet do they not give us that sort of pleasure which causes Laughter. *Dion Chrysostome* therefore, in the Passage produc'd by *Dr Bentley* seems to distinguish between the τὸ γελοῖον of Æsop, and his μῦθοι· Ἡνείχοντο αὐτὸν, says he, ἡδόμενοι δὲ τῷ γελοίῳ καὶ τοῖς μύθοις, implying, I think, that the One was not exactly the same with the Other. 'Tis true, Every-body knows, that the Æsopic Fables were after Æsop's time frequently call'd γελοῖα by the Greek Writers, and from thence *Ridicula* by *Avienus*: but 'tis not unlikely that the Original of this Use of the Word was from something Ridiculous in the Gesture, Look, and Mimical Wit of Æsop that accompanied 'em, when he first told 'em; rather than from the Structure of the Fable it self, which does not seem contriv'd to operate that way. I am willing to think therefore that the Name usually given to these Fables

bles, Γελοῖα, and the Office of Γελοτοποιίδας ascrib'd to *Æsop*, carry in 'em some small Hint of *Æsop*'s Uglinefs; for nothing is so Divertive, or raises Laughter so much as Deformity, especially when Wit goes along with it. We may observe therefore, that when *Homer* has a mind to excite this Light passion in his Serious Poem, he does it by the means of an Ugly Man (\*), and an Ugly God (†); *Thersites* and *Vulcan* are, as I remember, the only Two Γελοτοποιίδ' in the whole *Iliad*; the One on Earth, and the Other in Heaven.

'Tis dangerous conversing long with Dr *Bentley*; for I find I have slip'd here, e're I was aware, into his manner of arguing: however, in this I will still differ from him, that I offer these things as slight Guesses only, without laying any manner of Strefs upon 'em. I need 'em not, in order to shew the Dr his Error; and this is not a place to do justice to the Argument: *Eustathius*'s Single Testimony, without other Help, is sufficient to bring Confusion on our assuming Critic, who challeng'd Me, and all the World, to produce One Single Author before *Planudes*, that had given the *Least Hint* that *Æsop* was Ugly.

*Vanasor*, who started this thought to him (for This too is one of the Things that have escap'd the Observation of Others) mentions it with

---

(\*) Ἄλλ' ὁ, π ο ἱ ἔσσιτο γελόιον Ἀργείοισιν

Ἐμμεναι' ἀρχῆς δ' ἐάνηρ ὑπὸ Ἰλίων ἦλθιν. Il. β. 215.  
Upon which *Eustathius*, ὁ Θεσπίτης παναρχὴς ὢν, καὶ αὐτόθεν γέλωτα προκαλέμενος

(†) Ἀσβεσθ' δ' ἄρ' ἐνῶρτο γέλωτος μακάρεσσι θεοῖσιν]

Ὡς ἴδεν Ἡφαίστον ἐν δώματι ποίπτην ἄνα. Il. α. 599.

with Distrust, and as a Suspicion only;

Æsop, (says he) was the Picture of Homer's Therfites; unless Here too Planudes has imposed upon us (p. 25). Had

Thersitem Homericum referebat Æsopus oris habitum, & reliquâ facie, nisi & hic quoque imponit Planudes.

Our Critic, when he took the Hint it self from *Vavafor*, taken also his Wary way of proposing it, he might have sav'd himself the Shame of being confuted: but it was a proper Occasion for Dr *Bentley* to be Peremptory, when even a Jesuit was Modest.

The Method he has taken of improving *Vavafor*'s Suspicion into a Demonstration, is, by running over *Camerarius*'s Testimonies, and shewing, that in None of 'em there is any account of Æsop's Deformity, and that most of 'em are (as he thinks) inconsistent with it. The Learning here is not his Own, but the Logic most certainly is; for I dare say, never any Man so reason'd before him. I will give the Reader some account of it, after I have desir'd him to remember, that the Point in Debate between Dr *Bentley* and the World, is, not whether Æsop was Ugly to that Degree *Planudes* has merrily represented him to be (No-body was ever Silly enough to imagine it; nor did *Planudes* himself dream of being thus far credited): but the Dispute is, in general, whether Æsop were Ugly, or not? Our Critic denies that he was, in Vertue of his Old Argument, the Silence and Prætermission of Authors; and the Sum of whatever he has said on this occasion, comes to thus much. "It does not appear from Ancient Authors, that he was a Lump of Deformity, and a Scare-crow; therefore it is certain, he was not any ways

“deform’d; and therefore it is probable he  
(a) P. 157. “was very handsome (a). His Particulars are  
as follow.

In Plutarch's Convivium, No-body, he says,  
drolls on Æsop's Ugly Face, which could hardly  
(b) P. 149. have escap'd, if he had such an Ill one (b). I own  
No-body there drolls on the Mein of his Face  
(to use a Bentleyism); but the Mein of his Bo-  
dy, and his Natural Unwieldiness, I have  
shewn to be touch'd on, and their mentioning  
any One Instance of his Uglinefs, is as sure a  
Sign of his being Ugly, as if they had reckon'd  
up All. Had Æsop been so very Handsome,  
(c) P. 157. as Dr Bentley tells us he was (c), the τὴν βε-  
βήκας καὶ ἡμίονον τρέχεις of Chilo had been a piece of  
Raillery very ill apply'd.

But “Philostratus has given us in two Books  
“a Description of a Gallery of Pictures, One  
“of which is Æsop, with a Chorus of Ani-  
“mals about him. There he is represented  
“smiling, and looking toward the Ground in  
“a Posture of Thought, but not a Word of  
“his Deformity; which, were it true, must  
“needs have been touch'd on in an account  
(d) P. 149, “of a Picture (d). The Dr imposes upon  
150. us; the Picture he mentions is not design'd to  
represent Æsop, but The Fables; and by Their  
\* Mss. Name it is call'd \*. In it indeed Æsop has a  
Place; and he is so far describ'd there as Phi-  
lostratus had need of him, to express the Sub-  
ject of his Piece; to have gone farther would  
have been an Impertinence, utterly inconsis-  
tent with Philostratus's Character, who is a Short  
Writer, and exactly proper in his Circum-  
stances. His Words are, Æsop seems there, as  
if

if he were actually framing a Fable; His Smiling Face, and his Eyes fix'd upon the Earth, declare as much: the Painter knew very well that Fables are the Work only of Easie Minds \*. Would the Dr have had a Particular of Æsop's Deformities inserted here? to what purpose? when in the very mention of his Name they were sufficiently understood; and would have been of no manner of use towards imprinting an image of that Thoughtful Posture of Æsop the Artist chiefly design'd to express.

\* ὁ δὲ Νῆρ-  
μαίηνα  
ὑφαίνει  
μῦθον· τὸ  
δὲ μείδια-  
μα τὸ περ  
σώπει, καὶ αἱ  
ὀφθαλμοὶ  
καὶ τὸ γῆς  
ἐστίν τε τῷ-  
το δὴ λῶν.

Ἰδὼν ὁ ζωγράφος, ἐπὶ αἱ εἰς μῦθων φροντίδες ἀνεκλήνους τὸ ψυχρὸν εἶναι τῷ.  
Εἰκ. γ.

*Philostratus's* Intention was, to describe a Gallery of Pleasure, hung round with fine and delightful Paintings: in his Account of One of these, he had occasion to mention *Æsop*, and with good Judgment omitted those Particulars in his Description of him which were neither Taking to the Eye, nor at all Instructive, with relation to his Design in introducing him. Dr *Bentley*, I find, would have been improper enough to have describ'd him *Cap-a-pe* on this occasion; but *Philostratus*, tho' a Sophist, knew better. There is a Like piece of Address observable in his First Picture, where *Vulcan's* Engagement with *Scamander*, and his Victory over him is represented out of *Homer*; and which, I suppose, he plac'd in the Front of his Book, for the Honour of *Lemnos*, his Native Island: And for the Honour of That too, and to make his Draught perfectly pleasing, he gives us a *Vul-*

can as handsome, for ought appears to the contrary, as any Figure in his Gallery. Indeed he Ingeniously excuses the God's not appearing to be Lame, by saying, that the Rapid Motion, with which he seems to come from Heaven to the Combat with *Scamander*, must be suppos'd to cover that Defect: But he intimates nothing of his Other Deformities; tho' *Vulcan* was, according to the Poet's (†) account of him, as Ugly every way as *Æsop* was, according to *Planudes*.

This, I hope, sufficiently accounts for *Philostratus's* Omission; and as for the Statue erected to *Æsop*, at *Athens*, and made by the fam'd Hand of *Lyfippus*, it will be no argument of his Handsomness, till the Dr can prove, that this was an Honour done to Handsome Men only; which it will be no Easie Matter to do, because there is an Unquestionable Instance of a Statue, made by this very *Lyfippus*, and erected by order of the *Athenians*, to the Memory of a Man, full as Ugly as we need allow *Æsop* to have been: I will give it the Dr immediately, e're I part with this Argument.

The Greeks, he says, have several Proverbs about Deform'd Persons, as Θεῖσταιον βλέμμα, εἰδεχ-  
 (a) P. 150. θὴς Κορυθεύς, &c. but none upon *Æsop* (a). All  
 151. that follows from hence, is, that *Æsop* was not Ugly to a Proverb; which I willingly grant him, and am ready to leave *Planudes's* account  
 as

---

(†) Ἦ, καὶ ἀπ' ἀκμυθέτοιο ΠΕΛΩΡ ΑἰΗΤΟΝ ἀνέστη,  
 χαλεύων· ὑπὸ δ' ἐκνήμαυ ῥώοντο ἀεγιάι. &c.

as far as this comes to : but he might be Ugly enough for all that ; several have been so, that were never made Sayings of : I know Some, at this day, who write as Uglily as ever Æsop Look'd ; but their Style is not yet got into a Proverb, tho' perhaps hereafter it may ; and therefore This instance I will not insist on.

Agan, Æsop, he tells us, was Cræsus's Ambassador to Delphi (a) : he means, that he was sent of an Errand by him \* thither ; for such Mighty Monarchs as Cræsus did not use to make Other Mens Slaves, Their Ambassadors. But let his Title be as Glorious as the Dr pleases, his Person might nevertheless be Contemptible ; unless the Dr can prove, that the Delphians were as Nice of Temper as the Turks, and would pay no Regard to the Publick Minister of a Prince, unless he were Tall and Comely. Whatever Æsop's Person, or his Character were, They shew'd, I am sure, no great Veneration for Either, when they tumbl'd him down their Precipice.

After all, the Dr's Reasoning upon this Circumstance must be allow'd to be Just ; if Æsop were Short and Ugly, it is plain, as he pleasantly observes, that he could never make a Proper Ambassador.

There is another Objection drawn from Æsop's being a Polite Courtier, and a Man of Address : what if he were ? Many, I suppose, have been so, who were no Beauties ! Yes, but he was so, to that degree, as to rebuke Solon for his Gruff and Clownish Behaviour with Cræsus, and tell him, that he must converse with Princes, *ἢ ὡς ἡδιστα, ἢ ὡς ἡνυστα*, either Agreeably, or not at all (b). The



Thing he said was Handsome, I grant; but must *He* needs be Handsome that said it? I thought Ugly People had sometimes been as Witty, and as Wise as their Neighbours. But since he has mention'd this Aphorism of *Æsop's*, and professes to approve it, I must tell him, 'twere well if he'd follow it too, when the Itch of contradicting Great Men is upon him; and resolve to oppose his Betters *ἢ ὧς ἡδίστα, ἢ ὧς ἡμισυ*; either not at all, or with Decency.

Dr Bentley has yet One Reflection behind in behalf of *Æsop*; he has reserv'd it for the very Last Place in his Book; and we know him to be such a Master in Good Writing, that we may from thence be sure 'tis a fine one. Rhodopis, *Æsop's* fellow-slave, was, it seems, the greatest Beauty of her Age: if therefore (says he) we may guess him by his Companion and Contubernalis, we must needs believe him a Comely Person (a). This puts me in mind of his Argument about *Alæsa* (b), which he proves to be upon such a Coast of Sicily, because it happens to be mentioned with some Towns that are certainly upon that Coast; and which I have prov'd for that very Reason not to be there, because it is mention'd elsewhere, with some Other Towns, that are certainly not upon that Coast. If Rhodopis were extreamly handsome, *Æsop*, her fellow-Slave, must be so too! which is as if I should say, it was impossible that *Little Jeffrey* should be such a Dwarf as he is represented to be, because the Tall Porter and He were fellow-Servants. Must *Æsop's* Master needs buy his Slaves as we do Coach-horses

(a) P. 152.  
(b) Vide  
p. 124 of  
this Book.

horses in Pairs? and be as careful exactly to match 'em? Perhaps *Xanthus*, or *Iadmon*, or whoever he was, (for Authors differ) might be a little wantonly inclin'd; and having purchas'd *Rhodopis* for his Own Use, might fear, lest his Wife should return the Injury he did her; and so took *Æsop* into his House, who he knew would be no Temptation to her: or perhaps he pitch'd upon an Ugly He-slave, that he might be sure to keep the Fair She-slave to himself; and made use of *Æsop* as a kind of *Kuzlir-Aga*, to inspect his *Scraglio*. After all, what if I should turn the Tables, and say, That *Herodotus* and *Pliny's* mentioning this Little Particular, is a confirmation of the receiv'd Opinion about *Æsop's* Deformity? If *He* were as remarkably Ugly as *She* was Handsome, the Observation indeed was pretty, and not unworthy of those Authors; but Otherwise, 'tis Flat enough to have been made by Dr Bentley.

One would think the Dr in Jest, when he puts such things as These upon Us for Arguments; whereas He proposes 'em seriously and in good earnest, and fancies he has done wonders in the strength of 'em. To convince him, if it be possible, of the Weakness and Absurdity of his Proofs, I will (as I did once before\*) try 'em upon Another Subject; and see how far they will be allow'd to hold.

Whatever *Æsop* was, *Socrates*, we are sure, was excessively Ugly: Thus he is in short describ'd by *Xenophon*, (a) and *St. Jerome* (b): (a) In Flat-nos'd, Goggle-ey'd, Wide-mouth'd, Thick-lip'd, Pot-belly'd, Bandy-leg'd (c).  
\* In the Answer to the Dissertation on Phalaris. Sym. c. 4. 5. (b) Adv. Jovin. l. 1, p. 51. (c) All these Particulars but the Last, are taken from *Xenophon*.

Notwithstanding this, in that way of *Ratiocination* Dr Bentley has made use of, I will prove him to have been a very lovely and Beautiful Person. I will do it by Every One of the Arguments he has urg'd, except the First, taken from *Philoftratus's* Gallery; in which *Socrates*, the Famous Persecutor of *Sophists*, we may be sure, could have no place: but I shall make amends for the want of This Proof, by a New one of my Own, every whit as much to My Purpose as this is to Dr Bentl'y's.

Thus then Our Man of Criticism has taught Us to Speak, and Argue — “The *Athenians* set up a Noble Statue \* to the Honour and Memory of *Socrates*: had he been so Ugly as some would make him, it had been kinder to his Memory to let that alone. But the famous *Lysippus* was the Statuary † that made it. And must so great an Hand be employ'd to dress up a Lump of Deformity?

“The Greeks have several *Proverbs* about Persons deform'd, *Θερσίτερον βλέμμα, εἰδεχθῆς Κορυθεύς*, &c: Our *Socrates*, if so Ugly, had been in the first Rank of 'em: especially when his Statue had stood there to put every-body in mind of it.

“He was so far a Favourite of *Archelaus*, King of *Macedonia*, that he courted him to come, and live with him \*: but would such a Monster have been a fit Companion for a Prince? He is known to have been one of the best Speakers, and a Man of the greatest Address and Insinuation of any in his time; he had all the Chief Persons of *Athens* continually about him, and was ever instructing 'em in the Duties of Humanity and Courtesie, and all man-  
ner

\* Diog.  
Laert. in  
Socrate.  
Tertul. in  
Apol.

† Λυσίππος  
πλάτων ἐφ'  
το *Cautione*  
Laert. ibid.

\* Arist.  
Rhet. l. 2.

“ner of Sociable Virtues : Could ſuch a Character, ſuch a Station, or ſuch Diſcourſes be-  
 “fit *Socrates* if he was truly that Scare-crow he  
 “is repreſented to have been ?

He ſung, he play'd upon the Muſic (a), he danc'd (b), he wrote Verſes (c) : he was every way an Accompliſh'd Perſon ; and his Converſation therefore was cover'd by thoſe that were ſo themſelves. He made One often at the Meetings of the *Beaux Eſprits*, and ſate up Drinking and Laughing with 'em till Morning (d) : Is it credible, that a Man of ſuch Deformity could be ſo Acceptable, ſo Polite, and ſo Pleaſant ?

(a) Cic. in Catone.  
 (b) Xen. in Symp.  
 (c) Plat. in Conviv.  
 (d) Ibid.

But of all things, that which ought moſt to prevail with us to pronounce him not Ugly, is, that he was the greateſt Lover of Beautiful Perſons, and the moſt Belov'd by 'em of any of his Age : *Alcibiades*, *Critias*, *Agatho*, *Phædrus*, and the reſt of his Acquaintances, were all remarkably Handsome : “ ſo that if we “ may gueſs him by his Companions and Con-  
 “*tubernales*, we muſt needs believe him to be  
 “ a Comely perſon.

His Thoughts, his Diſcourſes were all of Love ; every thing he ſaid and did tended to inſpire people with it ; his Philoſophy was nothing but the Doctrīne of Love : and can we think he would have dwelt upon this Paſſion ſo much, and inculcated it ſo often, if He himſelf had been ſo very Unlovely and Diſagreeable ?

*Plato*, and *Xenophon*, have wrote Set-apologies for him, wherein they defend him, among other things, from the Imputation of corrupting the Youth of *Athens* by Unlawful Love :  
 had

had he been so deform'd, as he is said to be; how could they better have clear'd him of it, than by Urging the Improbability of his attempting such Impurities, in which he was so unlikely to prevail? But having said nothing of this kind in his behalf, it must be presum'd that they had nothing of this kind to say.

*Aristophanes*, who has expos'd and ridicul'd him upon twenty Other Accounts, has not a word, as I remember, of his Deformity; tho' this was the most Natural Subject for him to exercise his Comical Wit upon, and so Obvious, that, one would think, he could not have miss'd it.

I appeal now to any Indifferent Judge, whether I have not prov'd *Socrates* handsome by as good Arguments at least as our Critic has advanc'd to prove *Aesop* so? Indeed, they are most of 'em the very same; only urg'd further, and with more strength (if I do not deceive my self) in the Case of *Socrates*, than our Dissertator has been able to carry 'em in relation to *Aesop*. And yet after all I have said, I freely own, that the Testimony of any Ancient Writer concerning *Socrates's* Uglinefs, tho' it stood alone, and we had no Other to back it, would weigh more with Me than all these *Negative Authorities*. So weak an Argument is the Silence and Pratermission of never so many Authors in a Point where any Single Writer of Note has plainly declar'd himself, and his Account has been generally receiv'd and credited by Succeeding Ages.

But

But I offend in dwelling so long on these Trifles, which deserve rather to be Laugh'd at, than Confuted : I will trouble the Reader no further on this Argument than till I have suggested One Observation to him about Dr *Bentley's* odd Conduct in relation to *Æsop*. He is extremely concern'd to have *Æsop* thought Handsome, at the time that he is endeavouring all he can to prove him no Author. He hopes by his Civilities to his Person to atone for the Injuries he does him in his Writings: which is just such a Compliment to *Æsop's* Memory, as it would be to Sir *William Davenant's*, should a Man, in defiance of Common Fame, pretend to make out, that he had always a Good *Nose* on his Face ; but however, he did not write *Gondibert*.

Our Critic's Two Attempts are so very inconsistent, that 'tis hard to imagine why a Man should venture upon both of 'em at once : but Dr *Bentley* had a good Reason for it, they were Both *Paradoxes* ; and he cares not What, or Whom he writes for, or against, so he can but advance something which no-body ever ventur'd to maintain before him ; and which he is sure always to manage at such a rate, as that No-body will ever take it up after him.

I have done with what I intended to offer on Either of these Dissertations ; and, upon a Review of what I have said, am asham'd to see to what a Bulk this trifling Dispute has swoln. However, as Large as I have been upon it, I assure the Reader, that unless I had spar'd Dr *Bentley* very often, I must have been much Larger ; for his Absurdities are not yet  
near

near exhausted. But I am not likely to be the Last whose Pen will be employ'd on this Subject; and 'tis fit therefore that Some Matter should be left for Those that come after me.

\* Dissert.  
p. 68.

In that Dissertation where I am chiefly concern'd, Dr Bentley takes his Leave of the Argument, with Some particular Civilities to Me. He heartily wishes he could do any Service to that Young Gentleman of great Hopes whose NAME IS SET TO THE EDITION: but he can do him no greater at present, than to remove some Blemishes from the Book that is ASCRIB'D to him; which he desires may be taken aright, to be no disparagement to Himself; but a Reproof only to his Teachers \*. I would not willingly be behind hand with the Dr in any Instance of Courtesie; and therefore, in return, will, e're we part, bestow some Charitable Advice upon him: the rather, because I have reason to believe, that he has very little Advice from any Other Quarter. If he had, he would certainly never have written on this Subject, in the Manner he has done: for I have not so ill Thoughts of any One Man I know in the World, as to imagine, that he would have advis'd Dr Bentley to do as he has done, had His Opinion been ask'd in it. Young as I am therefore, I will take the freedom to do that kind Office to him, which his Friends, I find, either do not care, or are not allow'd to perform.

And

And the first piece of Advice that I will venture to give the Dr is, that he would know his own Talent; and resolve for the future not to venture upon any way of writing that Nature never design'd him for. Wit, and Ridicule, are either the most Diverting, or the most Insipid things in the World. I have the Opinion of good Judges, that he has no true Taste of either of these, and performs very untowardly in 'em. He would do wisely therefore to forbear 'em; and so he would, methinks, tho' he should have some little Knack at 'em: for *Grimace*, and *Banter*, and *Quibbles*, even when luckily hit of, are not very suitable to the Character of a Man in Holy Orders. And to give him my opinion what he is fit for, I think, (if he resolves always to be doing something out of his Profession) that the Collecting Greek *Fragments*, or *Proverbs*, would be a proper Employment for him. He has succeeded well in One of these, and would doubtless be as happy in the Other: for his Genius seems to lie very strongly that way; as one would guess, by the Multitude of Proverbs in all Tongues, (English, Latin, and Greek, but chiefly in the Last) of which he has empty'd himself into these Dissertations. And I am the rather apt to think, that such Works as these might thrive in his hands, because the well executing 'em depends chiefly on Two Qualities, which he must be allow'd to possess; Application, and a Willingness to be employ'd in such Sorts of Studies



dies, as only load the Memory, without improving the Understanding.

It is Another piece of Advice I should chuse to give the Dr, that he would, against he writes next, make use of that Relation he has to a Court, so far as to get a little Good Language, and Good Manners; without which, had he waded through all the Greek *Scholia*, and turn'd over every *Lexicon* extant, he would never write any thing that will either please or last. When he is making Reflections on Style, it is very proper, I think, that he should be well skill'd, not only in the Tongue he writes *of*, but in that too which he writes *in*: else, he will only make Sport for his Reader, if while he is correcting a Fault in One Language, he himself makes Ten New ones in another.

And till he understands his Own Tongue a little better than he does, he would do well to forbear Minting any New Words in it; which is the Work of Great Masters, and a Privilege allow'd only to Writers of the First Rate, who know the Compass of a Language, and see thro' all its several Beauties and Blemishes. Sir *William Temple* may say, *Sufficiency*, and the World will speak after him: Indeed we are convinc'd from some things that have come out a late, that there is such a mixture of Vanity, Indecency, and Ignorance, in some Mens Writings, as No One Word in our Tongue would perfectly answer; and there was need of a New one therefore to express it. But if Dr *Bentley* should

ſhould take the ſame Liberty, he would be ſure to be oppos'd in it; His *Commentitious*, and *Putid*, and *Vernacular*, and *Negoce*, will be hiſs'd off the Stage, aſ ſoon as they come on: For the Fine Speakers will never endure that a Man ſhould take upon him to coin New Words, who doesn't know how to uſe the Old ones.

Another thing I mightily recommend to him, is, that when he next pretends to fix the Age of Greek Words, and Phraſes, he would vouchſafe, among his other Greek Books, to read the *Bible*: leaſt he ſhould happen to pronounce Some Modes of Speech to be of Late Date, which are familiarly to be met with in thoſe Sacred Pages. For after all, ſhould his knowledge in Greek Learning prove never ſo great, yet it would not redound to his honour as a Divine, to appear well read in all Sorts of Books, but thoſe it beſt becomes him to be acquainted with, the Old and New Teſtament.

I am of Opinion too, that it would not be amiſs, if for this Twelvemonth next to come, he read over Dr *Hody's Vow* once every Morning: 'tis a Good One, and thoſe who pretend to underſtand Secret Hiſtory tell us, it was made upon a very Proper Occaſion. I will inſert it here, both for Dr *Bentley's* Benefit, and Dr *Hody's* Honour; who, it muſt be own'd, has acted up to it always, as a right good-natur'd Man, and an Excellent Scholar.

*It is my Prayer to Heaven,  
That my Name may never appear in the List of Writers,  
Or that I may always write as becomes a Person  
Of Ingenuous and Liberal Education,  
And a Lover of sound and useful knowledge ;  
A Searcher after Truth only,  
Without any Bitterness of Style ;  
Good-natur'd, Civil, and Candid ;  
So far from being dispos'd to any thing that is indecent,  
As not to be provok'd to it ;  
In short, a Despiser of Trifles (†).*

Next to this Short Vow of Dr. Hody's, I know no small Piece that will deserve his Reflections better, than *Lucian's Lexiphanes* (a). If he would read it often, take the good Advice that *Lucian* gives there, of *Sacrificing to the Graces, and to Perspicuity* (b); and suffer some

(†) Faxit Numen,

Ut vel æterno Ego silentio inter non scribentes delitescam,  
Vel semper, ut Virum Ingenuum, liberalis ac generosa  
Educationis veraque Philosophia studiosum decet,

Scribam:

Veritatis Unice Indagator,  
Absque omni Styli acerbitate,  
Mitis, Urbanus, Candidus,

Ad id quod indecens est adeò non pronus, ut nec movendus:  
Nugarum denique Contemptor.

*In fine Præmon. ad Malalam.*

(a) *Lexiphanes* is the Name of a Famous Pedant, fond of Hard Words and Affectèd Expressions. *Lucian*, in a Dialogue of his, gives a Vomit to him, and brings 'em all up, one after another. His Disease is excellently well describ'd by *Lucian* in these words: Οὐκ ἀνούς οἷα φέγγει; καὶ ἡμᾶς τὰς νῦν προσημειώσας καὶ λιπὼν, καὶ χαλίων ἑτῶν ἡμῶν διαλέγει; διασφύρων δ' γλώτταν, καὶ παρὰ τὰ ἀλλόκοτα συνιθεὶς, καὶ σπασθῶν ποικίλων ἐπ' αὐτοῖς, ὡς δὴ πύμα ὃν εἰς ξενίζοι, καὶ τὸ καθεστὸς νόμισμα τῆς φωνῆς παρακόποι. *Luc. in Lexiph.*

(b) Μάλιστα δ' οὕτως χάεσσι καὶ τῇ Σαφηνείᾳ. *Id. ibid.*

But that it did not, we have this further Reason to believe : that he quotes *Lynceus Samius*, in the 469th page, for a Passage, wherein this Cup is represented (not as a *Corinthian*, but) an *Athenian* Invention : for that, I think is the Natural Construction of *Lynceus's* words ; which I shall produce, and leave the Reader to judge of them \*.

\* *Lynceus Samius is brought in*

by *Athenæus* saying, that the *Rhodians* did ( Ἡδουπιδας ἀρνησιν μιμεριζουσαι ας τας Ἀθήνησι Θερικλέους ) work a sort of Cup (call'd ἡδουπιδες) in imitation of the *Thericlean* Cup, made at *Athens*. This Expression of *Lynceus* was probably in his Epistle to *Diagoras* mention'd in another place of *Athenæus* (p. 647.) where *Lynceus* does (ἐκ ὧν ἁλλὰ πέντε τὰ καὶ τὴν Ἀθηναίων ἐξαίρετος γινόμενα τοῖς ἐν τῇ Πείρῃ) compare the finest *Athenian* Manufactures with those of *Rhodes*. This implies, I think, that the *Thericlean* Cup was an *Athenian* invention ; at least, we have *Lynceus Samius's* word for it, no Contemprable Writer, and of pretty Early Date ; as being the Scholar and Acquaintance of *Theophrastus*. I know the Words ( τας Ἀθήνησι Θερικλέους ) are capable of another Sense ; but it is a forc'd and unnatural one.

Now if *Lynceus Samius's* Testimony be receiv'd, there's an end of *Athenæus's* Report about the *Corinthian* Potter. The Authors of that Report, whoever they were, might be as well out in the Time, as in the Country of *Thericles* : If he were no *Corinthian*, but an *Athenian* ; he might possibly be no Potter neither, but an *Archon*, or some Great Man : and the *Thericlean* Cups (as the *Ἀμυωνίδες* and *Ξελευκίδες* mention'd by *Plutarch* together with them \*) might be call'd so from him, that us'd 'em first, and not from him that invented 'em. Which their Size and Worth also would make us apt to believe : for *Athenæus* tells us, they were Extraordinary Large, and

\* In Vita P. Amil.

† Athenæ.  
p. 469.

\* He was  
Archon in  
Olympiad.

the 61st; as before, Page the 147th of these Papers.

and of a Vast Price; and could therefore be the Purchase only of Great and Wealthy men, till the *Rhodians* found out a way of making 'em Slight and Cheap; and then they grew Commoner †: and therefore, I say, one would be ready to think that some great Man who first us'd 'em, gave 'em their name; and not He that invented 'em. And if the most Learned Mr *Dodwell's* Opinion about the Age of *Phalaris* take place, (whom I hear he brings down to the LXXth Olympiad) we have the mention of an *Archon* preserv'd in *Diodorus*, who liv'd early enough to give the Name to these Cups: for he must be, by this account, above Thirty Years Older than *Phalaris* \*.

But because some of the Greek Comædians, and from them the General Stream of Later Writers mentioning *Thericles* as a Potter, directly oppose this account; therefore I will not pretend to build any thing upon it. Indeed I need it not, in order to disparage the Authority of *Athenæus*: from what I have produc'd out of him, I think, it manifestly appears, that no Weight is to be laid upon what He says in the point, who talks so loosely and waveringly about it; who produces Opinions on one side, and Opinions on t'other; who takes up a Report, an Hearsay, in one page, and contradicts it by a Substantial Testimony from an Approved Author, in another: and is all over Inconsistency, and Confusion. A Witness that thus talks forwards and backwards, in a breath, ought to be set aside by consent of both Parties; and leave

some Skilful Friend to administer to him the *Emetic Draught* there prescrib'd, it would do him a World of Service: by the help of this Physick, and these Directions, well pursu'd, he might in time become a sound Man again; and speak, and write like the rest of his Neighbours.

But if he be too far gone in his Distemper to have a Thorough Cure made upon him, yet at least it is very possible, and very requisite, that he should advance so far towards it, as to purge his Style of all Insulting Unbecoming Terms, and Injurious Reflections: for if he carries on this Critical War in that Un-souldierly Way he hath hitherto done, and throws out his Rudenesses without Decency or Distinction, he may happen to draw some Inconveniences upon himself that he is not aware of.

Especially he should take care, when the Angry Fit is upon him, not to vent it upon *Great Bodies* of Learned Men. A Single Writer may be trampled upon now and then, and receive Correction from his Hand without endeavouring to return it: but among Numbers, there will always be found Some, who have Ability, and Inclination, and Leisure enough to do Themselves and their Friends right upon the Injurer; tho' he were a Champion of ten times as much Strength and Prowess, as Dr *Bentley* thinks himself to be. Besides, Single Adversaries die, and drop off; but Societies are Immortal: their Resentments are sometimes deliver'd down from hand to hand; and when once they have begun with a

U man

man, there is no knowing when they will leave him.

'Twere well too, if he would think it a point of Prudence to observe some Measures of Decency towards the *Dead* as well as the *Living*; and not give himself that insufferable Liberty of attacking their Reputation, and their Works, in hopes that no-body will be generous enough to stand up in their behalf, and speak for those, who cannot speak for themselves. He has defy'd *Phalaris* and us'd him very coursfely; under the assurance, as he tells us, that *he is out of his Reach* \*: Many of *Phalaris's* Enemies thought the same thing: and repented of their Vain Confidence afterwards in his *Bull*. Dr *Bentley* is perhaps by this time, or will suddenly be satisfied, that He also has presum'd a little too much upon his Distance: but 'twill be too late to Repent, when he begins to Bellow.

\* Differ.

P. 40.

Since

**S**ince the third Impreſſion of theſe Papers was begun, there has fallen into my hands a view of the *Controverſie between Dr Bentley and me*, in order to the manifeſting the incertitude of *Heathen Chronology*. The Author has been very diligent and impartial in examining the Authorities on both ſides; and has drawn from each of us proper inſtances to make good his opinion. I agree with him in his main concluſion; and, as I am ready to make uſe of the light he has given me, to correct any miſtakes of mine he has obſerv'd, ſo I ſhall take the liberty to ſet him right, where I think he has miſtaken me.

Where I ſay, *We are ſure Zaleucus was a* <sup>View p. 45.</sup> *Pythagorean*. I mean no greater certainty than may be warranted from the Authorities I produce; and I think the Poſitive aſſertions of good Authors that expreſſy ſay *Pythagoras* and *Zaleucus* were Cotemporaries, more certainly prove that they were ſo, than the diſagreement of Writers about the age of *Zaleucus* argues that they were not ſo. The one's a direct proof of what I advance, the other is ſo remote and indirect, that 'tis only a conjecture of the contrary.

By the *undoubted Authority* of Pausanias in v. p. 53. the place alledged, I don't mean, as the Author of the *View* ſeems to underſtand me, that 'tis certainly to be rely'd upon againſt *Herodorus* and *Thucydides*: but only that his testimony is expreſs and full as to the time of *Zancle's* changing its name; whereas theirs is dubious and merely to be gueſt at from other circumſtances in Hiſtory. As for thoſe eminent *Chronologers* who, I ſay, fall in with this



account of Pausanias: they do all agree with him in placing this change as high as I contend for; though they don't all punctually agree to fix it in the same Olympiad. They all follow Pausanias (and pretend no other Authority) tho' they either do not read him, or don't understand him alike. Particularly *Meursius* (as well as *Lydiat*) professes to follow him; tho' he corrects what in one place he thinks a false reading to make him agree with himself. They all put the change of the name early enough to justify the Letters against Dr Bentley's exceptions; which was all the use I had to make of that passage in Pausanias.

V. p. 61. In the 140th page of my Book, where I say, *Those learned men who have taken pains to illustrate the Chronicon Marmoreum, have, by the concurrence of other Histories, plainly shewn that the time of Susario must fall between the 610th and 589th year before Christ.* I have not express'd my self so accurately, but that my Reader might easily misunderstand me; but my meaning is only this, That they who have illustrated the Marble, have plainly shewn that the Epochæ, to which Susario is there referr'd, must fall between the years 610 and 589 before the time of the first preaching of the Gospel.

V. p. 64. In a Marginal Note, p. 166. I quote *Eusebius* for putting Solon's Archonship a year later than *Soficrates* does; but, as this Gentleman observes, I should have said a year sooner.

He is pleas'd to tell me, *I don't declare what ground I have for the assurance, with which I say, that the Alceftis of Phrynichus was acted before Olymp. 67.* Perhaps I express'd my self too

too strongly on that occasion: But since I had prov'd *Theſpis* Cotemporary with *Solon*, who was Archon Olymp. 48; I think I might reasonably presume that, notwithstanding *Suidas's* date, *Phrynichus* writ no Play so late as Olymp. 67. i. e. above 80 years after his Master *Theſpis* flourish'd.

After a passage in *Plato* that I produce for the antiquity of Tragedy, I say, the reason of *Plato's* introducing it shows he thought Tragedy almost as antient as *Minos*. But this Author upon consulting *Plato*, finds that the reason of his introducing it shows no such thing; however, I am still of opinion it does. For *Minos* asks *Socrates*, how men came to have such an opinion of his Severity: *Socrates* tells him, the Tragedians fix'd that Character upon him, for Tragedy says he, is extremely antient in *Athens*, &c. Now this observation upon the Antiquity of Tragedy is not very pertinent methinks, unless he would intimate, that it came in quickly after *Minos's* time. At least he must mean thus much, I think; that Tragedy is as antient as the opinion that had long prevail'd in the world concerning *Minos's* rigour, or, probably before the Age of *Homer*, who places him among the infernal Judges.

He says I mistake in attempting to prove Tragedy Antient; by its being reckon'd among the funeral solemnities perform'd by the Athenians, at the Tomb of *Theseus*. I own I do; and the Authority of *Scaliger* I believe made me less careful than I ought to have been: He in his Book about Poetry has these words. *Tragediam esse rem Antiquam constat ex Historia; ad The-*  
*ſei*

*seu namque sepulchrum certasse Tragicos legimus*  
 He quotes no-body for what he says, and perhaps I was too hasty in not fully considering the whole passage of *Plutarch* in the Life of *Cimon*, relating to this matter.

If I shou'd allow my self mistaken in all those Instances, wherein this Author thinks me so; yet they do not in the least affect the main Argument I contend about. For whatever use may be made of 'em to prove Chronology uncertain, and me, among others, mislead in the accounts of time I follow; yet they do not lessen the force of any objections. I have made to Dr *Bentley's* reasonings against the Letters being genuine: which are chiefly built upon such grounds, as this Author has prov'd, are not to be rely'd upon. And if Dr *Bentley* himself shou'd, by the help of Chronological Tables, and confronting one Author with another, bring new Authorities to balance mine in such particulars upon which the stress of the Cause does not depend; he may show perhaps, by that method, that I am sometimes in the wrong: but he will never prove, that he's in the right. And, at that rate, this Controversie, which of it self is idle enough, will grow so dry and fruitless, that nobody I believe will expect it shou'd be continued: at least, I dare say, no-body will desire it shou'd be continu'd in that heavy *Bentleian* way. If any Reader therefore can bear the carrying on this Dispute any farther, I fancy he will be glad to have as many trifles as possible cut off, and rather to have a view of the Dr's Picture in Miniature, than that it shou'd be again drawn out at full length.

F I N I S.

A Short Account of

# Dr BENTLEY,

By way of

## INDEX.

**D**<sup>R</sup> Bentley's true Story of the MS prov'd  
false by the testimonies of

— Mr Bennet.	Pag. 6
— Mr Gibson.	P. 7
— Dr King.	p. 8
— Dr Bentley.	p. 19

*Dr Bentley's civil usage of Mr Boyle.* p. 10, p. 7  
& 8. (in *Dr King's and Mr Bennet's*  
*Letters*) p. 199, 284.

*His civil Language to*

— Mr Boyle.	p. 11, 94, 238, 284.
— Sir W. Temple.	p. 94, 199, 200.

*His Singular Humanity to*

— Mr Boyle.	p. 7, 9, 11
— Sir Edward Sherburne.	p. 15, 16
— Foreigners.	p. 14, 15

*His*

# INDEX.

## *His Ingenuity in*

- relating matters of fact. from p. 2, to p. 24
- citing Authors. p. 17, 18, 25, 26, 29, 117, 127, 132, 133, 150, 169, 212, 219.
- transcribing and plundering Notes and Prefaces of
  - Mr Boyle. p. 35, 113, 114, 131, 143
  - Vizzanius. From p. 54 to 60. 133, 193, 194
  - Nevelet. p. 247, 248, 261, 262, 263, 264, 265, 269
  - Camerarius. 273
  - Editor of Hesychius. p. 156
  - Salmalius. ibid.
  - Dr Bentley. p. 192

## *His Appeal to Foreigners*

- a suspicious Plea. p. 13
- a false one. p. 14, 15

## *His Charges against the Sophists return'd upon himself,*

- for forging History. p. 16, 117, 127
- for Solæcisms. p. 34, 91, 178
- for egregious dulness. p. 74, 106, 119, 135, 136, 137, 241
- for Pedantry. from p. 93 to 99, 144, 216
- for declaiming. p. 49, 50, 115, 116

## *His elegant Similes.* p. 11, 94, 97

## *His clean and gentle Metaphors.* p. 11, 97, 188

## *His nice taste*

- in Wit. p. 28
- in Style and Language,
- in Greek. p. 80, to 73, 203, 208
- in Latin. p. 34, 191, 206, 211
- in English. p. 34, 185, to 192

*His*

# INDEX.

- His old Sayings and Proverbs.* p. 11, 94, 116  
*His Collection of Asinine Proverbs, with an addition.* p. 220  
*His extraordinary talent at Drollery.* p. 36, 73, 117, 133, 214, 215  
*His choice of weighty points to debate.* p. 156, 192  
*His exactness in Chronology.* p. 118, 119, 140, 142, 165, 241, 243  
*His familiar acquaintance with Books that he never saw.* p. 76, 98, 115, 232  
*His respect to the Bible.* p. 23, 62, 63, 67, 68, 121  
*His New Discoveries*  
     — of the Buda MS p. 29, 30  
     — Empedocles's Epic Poem. p. 45. 195  
*His Old Discoveries*  
     — of Ocellus Lucanus being writ in Doric. p. 54  
     — of the Æsopic Fables transpos'd from Babrius's Scanzons. p. 248  
*His dogmatical air.* p. 97  
*His modesty and decency in contradicting great men,*  
     — Plato. p. 238  
     — Stobæus. p. 27  
     — Suidas. ibid.  
     — Fazellus. p. 32  
     — Capellus: ibid.  
     — Mr Selden. ibid.  
     — Grotius.  
     — Scaliger. } p. 158, 159  
     — all the Moderns }  
     — Casaubon. p. 156, 158  
     — Erasmus. } p. 236  
     — Scaliger. }  
     — Sir W. Temp. p. 27. 92. 199  
     — Mr Barnes. p. 39. 40  
     — Everybody. p. 27. 226. 237  
     His

## INDEX.

*His happiness in confident assertions for want*

— of Reading. p. 30. 31. 36. 40. 62. 63. 64.  
65. 66. 67. 68. 85. 100. 101.  
107. 126. 205. 206. 269.

— of Judgment. p. 69. 74. 109. 110. 161.  
182. 237

— of Sincerity. p. 76. 84. 111. 127. 132.  
212. 214. 215

*His surprizing Consequences,* p. 52. 55. 59. 114. 115.  
124. 125. 135. 136. 140. 144. 151. 158.  
209. 210. 211. 232. 235. 236. 240. 241.  
246. 253. 256. 257. 259. 273. 274. 277.  
278. 279.

*His profound Skill in Criticism.* From the begin-  
ning to

## THE END

---